The Christian Statesman

Vol. LI. FEBRUARY, 1917. No. 2.

The Outlook

Moving Pictures and the Sabbath

The friends of the Sabbath in the State of New York are engaged in a fight against vigorous efforts for the further desecration of the day; and deserve in this hour the earnest co-operation of Christian people in that State and elsewhere. At the opening session of the New York legislature five bills to legalize motion-picture shows on the Lord's day were introduced. It appears that the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of New York State, Third Department, November 22, rendered a decision declaring motion-picture shows conducted for personal gain to be illegal. The Fourth Department of the court had rendered a similar decision last May. Fearing the Court of Appeals will sustain this November decision, the National Association of Motion-Picture Industry and the Exhibitors' League of America have organized to get a bill through the legislature, which convened January 3. Able counsel has been secured to aid the moving-picture men in their fight before the Court of Appeals; and an aggressive campaign in general on their part is in progress. At a mass meeting of managers and owners of motion-picture houses a State Senator and the minority leader of the Lower House pledged the entire Democratic delegation of Senators and Assemblymen from New York County to vote for a bill to legalize such shows on the Sabbath. The Mayor and the Board of Aldermen, and Tammany Hall, are said to be in favor of such a movement. It is well for Christian people to be on the alert at once, or the battle may go in favor of the enemy. It is the business of civil government to protect the Sabbath, and also to observe it in the sphere of government, and not to make provisions that will allow it to be broken down. Our Christian civilization will not survive without the Sabbath. The degree in which it has been observed has done much to make our country what it is from a moral point of view. Mr. Robert G. Davey, counsel for the Lord's Day Alliance, says: "It is common knowledge that the forces opposed to the Christian Sabbath are lining up and organizing. Their avowed purpose is to force through our State Legislature an amendment of our Sunday law that will legalize the moving picture business, baseball, and other sports on Sunday. This will be, if successful, a step and a big one toward imposing upon the people of this State the Continental Sabbath with its entail of degeneration and disaster. We cannot believe that the Christian men and women of our churches through slackness, or lack of interest, or failure to measure up to the responsibility of the hour, will permit so great a misfortune to befall the heritage that they hold in trust for their children."

Prohibition for Washington

Another encouraging step on the road to national prohibition was taken on January 9, when the Sheppard bill to abolish, after November 1, 1917, saloons from the national capital was passed by the United States Senate. A majority of twenty-three was secured for the bill, and its friends claim it will pass the House. A proposal for a referendum to the District was lost by a tie vote. The measure prohibits the sale of liquor in the District of Columbia, but permits importation for personal use. Different provisions are attached to the bill. Efforts to forbid absolutely manufacture in the district and export from it were defeated; also an amendment which would have allowed the sale of wine, ale, beer, and porter, was defeated. It certainly is highly improper that such a pernicious institution as the legalized saloon shall continue to exist at the very centre of our governmental life and under the shadow of our Capitol; and if it shall be driven from this vantage ground, the prospects of its banishment everywhere else in our country will be considerably increased. God give the victory! It is ours to pray and work.

♣ ♣ ♣

Webb-Kenyon Law Upheld

The recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upholding the constitutionality and validity of the Webb-Kenyon law which prohibits the shipment of liquor from liquor States into prohibition States is a most encouraging event in the progress of temperance reform. The law was passed during President Taft's term, and was vetoed by him; but was passed again over his veto, and is now sustained by our highest court by a vote of seven to two. The official digest of the majority opinion representing six of the members says that Congress had the power under the constitution to adopt the Webb-Kenyon law; and that it is therefore decided that by virtue of this law "there is no power to ship intoxicants from one State into another in violation of the prohibitions of the law of the State into which the liquor is shipped. In other words, it is decided that since the enactment of the Webb-Kenyon law, the channels of interstate commerce may not be used to convey liquor into a State against the prohibitions of its laws or to use interstate commerce as the basis for a right to receive, possess, sell or in any manner use liquor contrary to the State prohibition." The Court also sustained West Virginia's recent amendment to her law prohibiting importation in interstate commerce of liquor for personal use. The Pittsburgh Gazette-Times in an editorial on the Court's decision remarks as follows:

The United States Supreme Court yesterday upheld the constitutionality of the Webb-Kenyon law which was designed to protect states which prohibit the liquor traffic against violation of their enactments from without. Under the statute thus given the highest judicial sanction, common carriers are prohibited from transporting, under the sacred cloak of inter-state commerce, liquor from "wet" states into "dry" territory. It makes prohibition laws as effective as is possible and will have the result of actually drying up all states that wish to be "dry." By the same decision the Supreme Court gives full effect to the West Virginia law which specifically forbids citizens of that state from receiving for personal use liquor shipped into the states by common carrier. If a West Virginian wants liquor he must go outside the state for it himself. His personal

liberty to drink liquor is not interfered with, but liquor ceases to be an article of legitimate commerce where a state enactment outlaws it. Evasion will be harder and violations of the prohibition law will diminish to the vanishing point in "dry" territory unless the authorities, local, state and national, conspire to permit them, which is not likely.

♣ ♣ ♣

The Temperance Tide

The discussion which the liquor question is receiving in the secular press is one of the most promising facts in the temperance situation in the present hour. Temperance legislation is a matter of news now as well as of moral reform; and the press cannot afford longer to ignore it. If certain other reform movements, such that against the iniquity of Mormonism, were only brought by the press before the people of our land with the same fullness as temperance is now discussed, it would not take the American people so long to come to an understanding of what should be done.

Henry Hall, staff correspondent, in the Pittsburgh Chronicle-Telegraph, not long since, furnishes an interesting article on the recent growth of prohibition in the United States. He refers to a map used at Washington by advocates of temperance legislation; and says it is a striking fact that but two States, and those as far apart as New Jersey and Nevada, are shown wholly in black, indicating that there are no dry sections therein; though it is true that there are two Indian reservations in Nevada where the sale of liquor is prohibited. Pennsylvania, New York, Missouri, Wisconsin, and Minnesota are the next blackest spots on this map, but in all of them there is a good deal of local option territory. The growth of prohibitory legislation is all the more striking when we observe that of the 2,543 counties in the United States 2,047 were dry before the November election; and that election added 191 more counties to the dry list, leaving but 355 wet counties in the whole country. To show the contrast that already exists in the matter of temperance with the recent past the correspondent quotes a unique statement from Abraham Lincoln in an address by him on February 22, 1842, Washington's birthday, before the Washington Society of Springfield, Illinois:

I have not inquired at what period of time the use of intoxicating liquors commenced, nor is it important to know. It is sufficient that to all of us who now inhabit the world, the practice of drinking is just as old as the world itself—that is, we have seen the one just as long as we have seen the other. When all such of us as have now reached the years of maturity first opened our eyes upon the stage of existence, we found intoxicating liquors recognized by everybody, used by everybody, repudiated by nobody. It commonly entered into the first draught of the infant and the last draught of the dying man. From the sideboard of the parson down to the ragged pocket of the houseless loafer, it was constantly found. Physicians prescribed it in this, that and the other disease; governments provided it for soldiers and sailors; and to have a rolling or raising, a husking or hoedown, anything, in short, without it was positively insufferable. So, too, it was everywhere a respectable article of manufacture and commerce. The making of it was regarded as an honorable livelihood, and he who could make the most of it was the most enterprising, and respectable. Large and small manufactories of it were everywhere erected, in which all the earthly goods of the owner were invested. Wagons drew it from town to town; boats bore it from clime to

clime, and the winds wafted it from nation to nation; and the merchants bought and sold it by wholesale and retail, with practically the same feelings on the part of the seller, buyer and bystander as are felt at the selling and buying of plows, beef, bacon or any other of the real necessities of life. Universal public opinion not only tolerated but recognized and adopted its use.

In contrast with the words of Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Hall quotes a statement of William Allen White in a letter read in the Senate during the debate on the prohibition of the liquor traffic in Washington: "I have your letter asking me something about prohibition in Kansas. I have grown from childhood to the age of forty-two years in Kansas, and I am probably greatly prejudiced in its favor. As a young man, from the time I was sixteen years old until I was twenty-two, I never saw an open saloon. I know of thousands of children in the state who never saw a saloon."

In this connection it is interesting to observe the following quotation from the liquor organ, Mida's Criterion, in the Literary Digest: "Only eleven more States need adopt prohibition to give the required two-thirds to adopt an amendment to the Federal Constitution, and then—curtain! But in the wet States there are many dry communities! True, with most of the great cities on our side, we still have a tremendous population with us—but let us not sink into any smug content, because we might have a fearful shock some bright morning! Boston, New York, Rochester, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Washington City, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Louisville, Memphis, Chicago, New Orleans, Kansas City, St. Louis, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Milwaukee, Jersey City, Newark, Camden, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and a few others are with us—and their total population is tremendous. But the outlying communities in these States are enough in many instances to put the States themselves dry! Don't overlook that serious fact. Detroit, Denver, Portland, Spokane, Seattle! They have been taken from us. So the time has come when it is possible to capture the larger cities by capturing the States! . . . If we are going to stay in business it will be by the force of our united efforts, and in no other way. The public shows no change in heart. There is no indication that the prohibition forces are weakening any. They are growing stronger, and the recent election must be our battle-cry. It is now up to us, and up to nobody else. Unless we carry our message all over this great land, there will be one unbroken stretch of hot sand from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Canadian border to the Rio Grande." We give the above statement in one section, not exactly as the writer presents it, in many short paragraphs, and with many italicised words. He is evidently much exercised over the situation, and makes a strenuous effort to state his position with great emphasis. It is wise to learn from the enemy; and there is certainly much encouragement for the friends of temperance in these words.

♣ ♣ ♣

A Conservative Section

That the battle for prohibition and sobriety is, however, not yet won is evident not only from the above reference of the liquor organ to the great cities, but also from the fact that the most populous and wealthy portion of our country has not yet been much affected by State prohibition. If we

consider the north-eastern part of our country, or the fourteen States which, roughly speaking, are to be found east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio, we find only two of them prohibition States, Maine and Michigan, the latter very recently added to prohibition ranks. These fourteen States contain, according to the census of 1910, a population of 44,000,000, or nearly one-half of our total population. They contain also the following nine cities: Milwaukee, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati, and Chicago; which were estimated to have on January 1, 1916, a population of 12,859,000. It is true that three-fourths of our States, whether they are large or small, whether they have many great cities or not, can carry an amendment to the Federal Constitution, but the part of the country mentioned has great influence over the country as a whole, and the city is the hardest place, and hardest in proportion to its size, to make prohibition effective. However it is ours to rejoice in the progress made and in the prospect of yet greater things; and to move straight on in the effort to make this a saloonless nation in law and in fact by 1920.

♣ ♣ ♣

Is Speedy Peace Desirable?

The continuance of the war with its great destruction of property, and of physical and moral life, and its immeasurable suffering and anguish, is so terrible a fact and condition, that it is not surprising that there is such wide-spread desire for a speedy peace, with the hope that somehow there may be a proper adjustment of world conditions. Cannot this terrible slaughter be stopped until rulers can consider what adjustment may be made? This is not an unnatural question. Yet we confess that we are unable to perceive how a peace established on the basis of present conditions could be either righteous or permanent. While not asserting that either side is free from blame in the past or present, and admitting that conditions may not yet be fully known for an absolutely complete judgment, we feel that the distinction betwen right and wrong is of more importance than mere peace at once, and more certain to secure lasting peace. There is justification for the President's positive efforts after peace in the present hour in the purpose to avert war for our own country, but that purpose must be kept subordinate to the question of right and wrong.

"A Plea for a Lasting Peace" has been sent out over such names as those of Lyman Abbott, George Wharton Pepper, George F. Pentecost, John Timothy Stone, W. T. Ellis, S. Parks Cadman, R. F. Coyle, Joseph M. Steele, George Innes, W. R. Moody, and N. D. Hillis; and while it may seem somewhat too strongly stated, it certainly contains much timely truth. It is asserted that the statement is not in any wise inspired by or promoted or supported financially by any organization or cause; that it has no political significance whatever, and that the political affiliations of the signers were neither considered or known by those who circulated the document for signatures. The Statement recognizes the fact already mentioned that when war drenches Europe in blood, it is natural that we should shudder at the sight, but that to call upon the combatants to stop the carnage is an impulse so strong that it even tends to displace judgment and

distort values. Peace is the triumph of righteousness and not the mere sheathing of the sword. The signers assert that they are Christians and as such deem that truth and righteousness are to be maintained inviolate even at the sacrifice of physical life; that they are citizens of the United States, and conscious of the solemn responsibilities of their Christian citizenship; and that they venture to direct the attention of their fellow-Christians to a few of the vital issues which are making their mute appeal for decision:—The ravage of Belgium and the enslavement of her people; was it right or wrong? The massacre of a million Armenians; was it a permissable precaution or an unpardonable crime? The desolation of Serbia and Poland; was it a regrettable necessity or a frightful injustice? The destruction of life through the sinking of the Lusitania and of other merchant ships; was this an ordinary incident of warfare, or was it deliberate and premeditated murder? The starvation of Jews and Syrians in the Holy Land; is this an accident of economics or a violation of the laws of God and man? The attempt to array Moslems against Christians in a holy war; was it a laudable act of imperial statesmanship, or was it the treachery of a Christian monarch? The intimidation of small nations and the violation of international agreements; are these things excusable under provocation, or damnable under all circumstances? In the presence of these pending and unsettled issues these appellants feel impelled to warn their brethren against those who cry peace, when there is no peace. They solemnly declare their conviction that the question of all questions for immediate consideration is this: Shall the ancient Christian inheritance of loyalty to great and divine ideals be replaced by considerations of mere expediency?

We feel that our friends in this vigorous paper have stated their position somewhat too sweepingly; but they present much that is important and in danger of being overlooked in the present hour. While we shrink from not being counted among those who desire peace at once, it must be clearly recognized that righteousness is immeasurably more significant than peace; that certain great issues of righteousness are at stake; and that the securing of peace under present conditions apparently affords no promise of the settlement of these issues on a righteous basis.

* * *

Mr. Baker and the Sabbath

One of the daily papers of Pittsburgh on a recent Monday morning announced that on the previous morning about six o'clock Mr. Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War, had slipped into our city, and that just as quietly and unobtrusively he slipped out of the city again at six o'clock in the evening on his way to his home city of Cleveland. It also stated that during the twelve hours he was here he made what he declared was a thorough inspection of the Allegheny river bridges, the raising of which is a question of great importance to this community, and one which the Secretary must determine. For comparison's sake he also made an inspection of the bridges over the Monongahela river. He saw, as he himself put it, all there was to be seen both by land and water. The land trip was made in a motor car, and government boats took him up and down the rivers. His companion on the trips was Colonel Jadwin, United

States Engineer, in charge of this district. The Secretary seems to have been quite busy and energetic on this Lord's Day; and he said he would, as the result of his inspection, go back to Washington better enabled to study the briefs submitted to him on the bridge-raising controversy and to reach a conclusion.

It is not our purpose here to say anything about the bridge-raising project, or about the character of Mr. Baker in general, but it certainly is as plain as a pike's staff, that the Secretary did not need to come to our city, and conduct this work, on the Lord's Day. Though he is Secretary of War, no emergency like that of war required it; and no matter how busy he is, he did not need to take the Lord's time for such work. It is wrong for any man to do unnecessary work on the Sabbath; and it is immeasurably worse for a man in a prominent public position, whose example distinctly affects the public welfare. The Secretary evidently violated the law of the State, that of 1794, which forbids any one to "do or perform any worldly employment or business whatsoever on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday (works of necessity and charity only excepted)." And rather oddly, in connection with the present incident, one provision of the law of 1794 is: "No part of any act of assembly heretofore passed, shall be construed to require any canal or railroad company to attend their works on the Sabbath days, for the purpose of expediting or aiding the passage of any boat, craft, or vehicle along the same." So we see that in the very sphere where the Secretary was busy on the Lord's Day the law is particular to provide for the keeping of the Sabbath. The Secretary does not stand alone in this act of disregard for the Sabbath, for the day has been desecrated by others among our prominent officials; but his visit to our city on this occasion has not strengthened him in the eyes of many of our best people, nor strengthened the cause of Sabbath observance among us.

♣ ♣ ♣

Can the State Teach Morality?

No more vital question confronts the American nation than the relation of the training of our children in the schoolroom to the future prosperity of our country. The character of the instruction given to the child of to-day determines, in considerable degree, the character of the nation of to-morrow. The Presbyterian of the South, whose first page is filled with thoughtful and interesting comment on present issues, thus speaks in a recent number on the moral training of our youth:

Religion in the public schools and their relation to each other is one of the problems that occupies the thought and attention of many wise men to-day. It is felt that the youth of the land are not getting the moral and religious training that they ought to have. The State through the public schools comes in touch with more of these young people than any other institution. So many feel that, while the State is training the brain, some attention should be given to the heart also. In order that the boy may become a first-class citizen, he must have both head and heart educated. The heart cannot be trained without religion. Is it not the part of the Church rather than of the State, to furnish religious training? Suppose the whole Christian Church of this country were doing all that it possibly could do to train all the people, young and old, in the vital truths of religion, there is no reason why everyone in all this land should not be reached. And if this should be done, there would be no need to turn

this duty over to the State, which cannot do it half so well. The serious question for the Church to consider is, whether it will do its duty or shirk it and try to turn it over to the State.

It is true that the Church is the great teacher in the moral sphere especially with regard to those truths which concern the salvation of the individual. But the nation as a moral being is qualified to take cognizance in countless ways of things in the moral sphere. Religion does not relate to the church alone, but just as certainly concerns the state. Christianity is not ecclesiastical. It is distinctly, and in a preeminent sense, the function of the church to furnish religious training to all of her people, and to all others, older and younger, whom she may be able to reach. But the state as a moral being can also deal with moral matters. The responsibility of the state for the punishment of crime implies, as has been said before, the previous obligation to furnish instruction in morality. The state is the only organization that can provide a universal system of education. It alone has the authority and ability to do so. It can require attendance, and can levy taxes for the necessary equipment. The church in its present divided condition could not provide any general arrangement for education, and in its present limited activities could not reach near all the children of the land. To allow the work of moral education to remain wholly in the hands of the church would be to allow the most needy, from a moral point of view, to remain in considerable degree untouched as to moral education. Also it is not the function of the church to furnish all of such instruction. The family and the nation both have their direct relation to the Word of God, and have a work to perform in furnishing moral teaching. When the church has done all that she is able in this connection, the state and the family have both still a duty to perform in the instruction of the children of our land in morality.

Editorials

CHRIST THE REIGNING KING

It is one of the fundamental principles of the National Reform movement that Jesus Christ is the Ruler of nations and should receive that recognition and homage from nations that is due from subjects to their rulers.

What is meant by this assertion? This question is sometimes asked by earnest inquirers after the truth. It signifies that God who is certainly supreme over all things has committed into the hands of Jesus Christ the Mediator between God and man the administration of the divine government.

But the questioner agains inquires, how do you reconcile the assertion that Christ is now actually reigning with the existence of so much evil in the world? It is admitted that the problem of evil is a hard one to solve. We do not think that any philosopher or theologian has yet given us the final answer. But it is as easy to explain the existence of evil with Christ on the throne as it is to explain it with the Absolute God on the throne, and every believer in the existence of God believes that he

is the King and Ruler of the universe. The truth is that the most of those who have undertaken to grapple with the problem of evil find their chief difficulty to be to reconcile its existence with the existence of a Supreme Being possessing moral attributes.

It follows therefore that the problem of evil does not concern us any more than it does any other believers in God, and that it is not a problem to be urged in opposition to the proposition that Jesus Christ is the reigning King.

The proof that Jesus Christ has been enthroned and that he is now administering the affairs of God's government of the nations of the world must of course be largely Scriptural. It may be instructive to quote a few of the many texts of Scripture which teach this truth.

He is declared to be actually enthroned and crowned. "He has on his head many crowns." (Rev. 10:12). In Hebrews he is said to have sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high. This is followed by a quotation from Psalm 45 and applied to him: "Thy throne, O God is forever and ever, and the sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." (Heb. 1:3, 8). Peter states that he has gone into heaven, angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him." (1 Peter 3:22). He himself declares that all authority in heaven and on earth has been given unto him and that he has already taken his seat on the Father's throne. (Matt. 28:18; Rev. 3:21). It is a great mistake, bordering on heresy to make a distinction between the throne of the Father and the throne of Christ, and to say that he is waiting on his Father's throne for the time to come for him to occupy his own throne. In God's universe there is but one kingdom and one throne. As a reward for his work of redemption the Father gave this throne to Christ as Mediator. He shares it with all who gain the victory over the world.

It is stated in Scripture that all things have been placed under him as Ruler. "He is Lord of all." (Acts 10: 36). "He put all things in subjection under his feet." (Eph. 1:22). There are two classes of statements relating to this matter. In one class it is declared that all things have been put under him. In the other class it is just as plainly declared that all things are not yet put under him. There is danger of arriving at wrong conclusions, if one of these statements is taken to the exclusion of the other. Let us place them side by side and see whether or not they will explain themselves. "For he must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death. For, he put all things in subjection under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put in subjection, it is evident that he is excepted who did subject all things unto him, And when all things have been subpecter unto him, etc." (I. Cor. 15:25-28). "Thou didst put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he subjected all things unto him, he left nothing that is not subject to him. But now we see not yet all things subjected to him, but we behold him who hath been made a little lower than the angels, even Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor." (Heb. 2:8, 9).

Taking these passages together there need be no difficulty in reaching the right solution of the seeming difficulty. The facts declared are these. Jesus has already been crowned. He has

been given the right to rule over all his enemies. By the appointment of the Father all things have been placed under him as the rightful ruler. But there are unsubdued enemies. These are under him by virtue of his enthronement, but not by an act of submission on their part. Jesus must reign while the process of subjugation is going on, as Paul plainly declares in the words, "He must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet." The essential facts may be illustrated by an historical event in our own country. Abraham Lincoln was elected President of the United States in 1860. Eleven states seceded. Their right to secede was challenged. By right of his election Lincoln was as truly President of those eleven states as he was of those that remained loyal. Lincoln was elected and inaugurated President of the whole country. He was President of the whole United States while the war was in progress, though it took four years to put those eleven states under him, yet by right they were under him from the first. Even so it is with the authority of Christ over the world. The process of subjugation is a long and tedious process. But wonderful progress has been made. Christ the reigning King is leading his people to complete and final victory over the nations of the earth.

GERMAN PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION, AND POLITICS

In the editorial department of the October 1916 issue of the Christian Statesman, certain criticisms were made of the philosophy, religion and politics of Germany. We said, "Unless the Germans abandon the philosophy that teaches the necessity of war, that makes might right, that the Kaiser is the embodiment of the Divine Being in a very special sense, that through the working out of German Kultur the Germans have succeeded in evolving the Super-man, Germany has not learned her lesson." A communication has been received from a highly esteemed reader of this journal calling in question the accuracy of the charges here implied. Our correspondent says, "Granting, for the sake of argument that some Germans may hold such views—I shall be obliged to you to obtain proof that the Germans, as a whole, can be charged with such views. Coming in contact with a goodly number of Germans, reading considerable of their literature, I have not been impressed that such opinions are held by the Germans as a whole. The same applies to your assertion about Germany's Pantheistic-anti-supernaturalistic views of religion."

In our editorial article to which reference is here made no quotations were given. Some acquaintance with the German philosophy of the past hundred years and with the political writings of such men as Professor Heinrich von Treitschke and Bernhardi is necessary to appreciate the real situation in Germany today. It is altogether probable that many Germans both in America and in the Fatherland know little about the theories that have made the German government what it is and which have developed Prussian militarism and brought on the present war. But the genius of the German monarchy renders the opinions of such people of no account whatever as will be seen presently.

First of all let us discover the attitude of Germany on the question of

Pantheism. This does not mean the attitude of the many Germans who are orthodox in their religious faith, but the attitude of political Germany. Ernst Haeckel, professor at the University of Jena, speaks as follows; "Pantheism teaches that God and the world are one. The idea of God is identical with that of nature or substance. * * * The latter view (Pantheism) alone is compatible with our supreme law—the law of substance. It follows necessarily that pantheism is the world system of the modern scientist." (The Riddle of the Universe, pp. 288, 289).

Professor John Dewey of Columbia University is the author of a volume entitled "German Philosophy and Politics." He traces the development of German philosophy from the days of Kant down to the present time and shows its bearing on German politics. According to German philosophers freedom consists in the proper view of the "science of knowledge." Of all the peoples of the world the German people alone have come into possession of the idea and ideal of absolute freedom. Hence the peculiar destiny of the German scholar and the German State. It has become the duty and mission of German science and philosophy to contribute to the cause of the spiritual emancipation of humanity. "Men who have attained to a consciousness of the absolute freedom and self-activity must necessarily desire to see around them similar free beings. The scholar who is truly a scholar not merely knows, but he knows the nature of knowledge—its place and function as a manifestation of the Absolute. Hence he is in a peculiar sense, the direct manifestation of God in the world—the true priest." (pp. 71, 72). During a large part of the nineteenth century this pantheistic theory dominated the thought of Germany. Before the century closed voices of protest were heard, but it is clear from the attitude of such men as Haeckel that it has a commanding influence yet among German scientists.

What is the relation of this pantheistic philosophy to German politics? We quote from Professor Dewey: "It is a commonplace of idealistic theism that nature is a manifestation of God. But Hegel says that nature is only an externalized, unconscious and so incomplete expression. The State has more, not less, objective reality than physical nature, for it is a realization of Absolute spirit in the realm of consciousness. The doctrine presents an extreme form of the idea, not of the divine right of kings, but of the divine right of States. * * * The State is God on earth." (p. 111). "History is the movement, the march of God on earth through time. Only one nation at a time can be the latest and hence the fullest realization of God. The movement of God in history is thus particularly manifest in those changes by which unique place passes from one nation to another." (p. 118).

It is the profound conviction of the leaders of German thought that Germany is now the one great nation that is the embodiment of the Absolute or God, and is appointed to lead the world into freedom. The Germans alone, it is held, possess that rationalistic spirit, in fact all those qualities which are necessary for leadership in establishing the divine kingdom on earth.

This raises the question as to the German conception of civil government. Quite recently Heinrich von Treitschke's principal work, entitled "Politics," has been published in

English. He teaches that the State is Power. He says that Machiavelli was the first to infuse this idea into politics and then adds, "It is the truth, and those who dare not face it had better leave politics alone." He says again, "We say that power is the vital principle of the State, as faith is that of the church, and love that of the family." (Vol. I. p. 23). "Weakness must always be condemned as the most disastrous and despicable of crimes, the unforgivable sin of politics. Some weaknesses of character are excusable in private life, but never in the State. It is power, and cannot be too hardly judged if it belies its essence." (Vol. I. p. 95). Monarchy is that form of government under which this power can be most effectually developed and wielded. The unity of the nation finds expression in the Emperor. "In a republic, authority is founded upon the will of the governed, while in a monarchy it is derived from the historical claim of a particular family, and concentrated in the will of one man who wears the crown and who, though surrounded by more or less responsible advisers, ultimately decides every question himself. It is idle to toy with metaphors: the minimum test of monarchy is whether or not the will of the monarch can be overruled." (Vol. II. p. 59). "Nevertheless it is only a secondary feature of monarchy that in it authority resides in the will of a single individual; the primary consideration is that this authority is not delegated but original and inherent in him." (p. 59).

Under such a system the highest duty of the individual is to obey the State, to sacrifice himself for it. This is true patriotism, and patriotism is religion. No matter how erroneous the State may be it is the duty of the citizen to support it. Treitschke has no difficulty in settling the question as to the proper attitude of a citizen toward the government in carrying on an immoral war. In his discussion of the question "How far is the individual responsible for the morality of the State?" he says, "The machinery of the political world would cease to revolve if every man made bold to say 'The State should not; therefore I will not.' We know of wars which have proved to be absolutely necessary, which have nevertheless been repudiated by the nation and its spokesmen. We have therefore no assurance that the subjective judgment of the individual citizen is nearer the truth than that of the King or the minister responsible, who command so much wider a political horizon. I cannot be held responsible for a war which I personally do not approve of, but I am still under the obligation to serve my country if it breaks out. * * * The individual should feel himself a member of his State, and as such have courage to take its errors upon him. There must be no question of subjects having the right to oppose a sovereignty which in their opinion is not moral." (Vol. I. pp. 104, 105).

This leads to the question as to the relation of nations to the moral law. Treitschke insists with the utmost emphasis on the obligation of States to be moral. But what is it for a State to be moral? He contends that the moral law for States is not the same as the moral law for individuals. Since the very essence of the State is power, "its highest moral duty is to uphold that power." (Vol. I. p. 94). While objecting to the crude form of the Jesuit proverb that the end justifies the means he contends that there are many cases where it is not possible to use means that are not above reproach,

although he thinks it best to use means that are in themselves moral when possible. He holds that "It is necessary then to choose between public and private morality, and since the State is power its duties must rank differently from those of the individual. Many which are incumbent upon him have no claim upon it. The injunction to assert itself remains always absolute." (Vol. I. p. 94).

It is by a very subtle process that Treitschke maintains the doctrine that might makes right. Power is the essence of the State. Therefore the highest duty of the State is to maintain its power. Even the moral law must not be allowed to stand in the way. The State is under moral obligation, but what is the moral law for the State? Not the Ten Commandments since they were only legal enactments for the Jews. Love and liberty of conscience are the chief commands of Christianity, and this is all that the Decalogue means for Christians. Christianity has no rigid standard. "A moral code is exactly what is lacking." There are certain virtues which might well characterize the State, but they must not be allowed to stand in the way of the first and greatest duty of the State to develop and maintain power. If this is not the doctrine that might makes right it is difficult to see what Treitschke means.

This brings us to the last thing calling for consideration, namely the German doctrine concerning war. The absolute necessity of war is maintained over and over again by Treitschke. This necessity is one chief reason why the entire human race should not be combined under one government, for in that case there would be no rival or hostile nation to fight. He says, "War and the administration of justice are the chief tasks of even the most barbaric States. But these tasks are only conceivable where a plurality of States are found existing side by side." (Vol. I. p. 19). "The greatness of war is just what at first sight seems to be its horrors—that for the sake of their country men will overcome the natural feelings of humanity, that they will slaughter their fellow men who have done them no injury, nay, whom they perhaps respect as chivalrous foes. Man will not only sacrifice his life, but the natural and justified instincts of his soul; his very self he must offer up for the sake of patriotism; here we have the sublimity of war." "He who knows history knows also that to banish war from the world would be to mutilate human nature." (Vol. II. pp. 395, 396). As to the binding power of treaties Treitschke holds that since they are entered into voluntarily they are "concluded on the tacit understanding **rebus sic stantibus.** No State ever has, or ever will exist which is willing to hold to all eternity to the agreements which it signs. No State will ever be in a position to pledge its whole hereafter to a treaty, which cannot fail to be a limitation to its sovereignty. It always intends that the contract shall eventually be nullified, and shall only apply so long as the present circumstances are not totally altered." (Vol. II. p. 596). "All treaties lose their force at the very moment when war is declared between the contracting parties; moreover, every sovereign State has the undoubted right to declare war at its pleasure, and is consequently entitled to repudiate its treaties." (Vol. I. p. 28).

It is the teaching of Treitschke that war will never cease. "No court of arbitration will ever succeed in banishing war from the world." "We have already seen that war is both justifiable

and moral, and that the ideal of perpetual peace is not only impossible but immoral as well." "War cannot vanish from the earth as long as human sins and passions remain what they are." "The arbitrament of force is the logical outcome of the nature of the State. The mere fact of the existence of many States involves the necessity of war." (Vol. II. pp. 598, 599).

It should be remembered that Heinrich von Treitschke was one of the men who made Germany what it is. It is readily seen that the German war policy is framed precisely on the plan here indicated. It is also seen from quotations given that the private opinions of individuals have no weight in determining the policy of the State. It is quite clear therefore in what sense certain views are attributed to Germany and the Germans. There is one other issue raised by our correspondent, namely, the divine right of the Emperor, which will be considered in the article below.

♣ ♣ ♣

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF KINGS

It is generally held by men who believe in the existence of a Supreme Being and who have any political theory as to the origin of the State that there is a vital connection between civil government and the government of God. One of the principal questions that have engaged the attention of students of political science is the question as to the nature of this relation and how it should be expressed. The ancient monarchs of Asia often claimed to be sons of the gods and to have inherited a divine right to rule. This claim was made in later ages by such men as Alexander the Great.

The problem as to the divine right of kings sprang up in a new form in the middle ages. The popes claimed to possess a divine right to rule over both church and state. It was held that two swords, the ecclesiastical and the civil, were placed by Christ in the hands of the first pope. The first he was to keep and use for the welfare of the church, and transmit to his successor. The second he was to hand over to the civil magistrate to be used in subordination to the pope for the welfare of both church and state. According to this theory the pope has the right to depose kings and emperors and to set up others in their places. Such a theory was very displeasing to the majority of civil rulers. They therefore put forth the claim that their right to rule was just as divine as that of the pope. They did not dispute the pope's right to rule over the church, but they held that the boundaries of the church formed the boundaries of his proper authority.

This theory of the divine right of kings was adopted in many European countries. James I. of England wrote a book in which he undertook to maintain the doctrine, first, from Scripture, second, from reason, and third, from history. The Stewart dynasty held to this doctrine to the very end. The Covenanters of Scotland, especially during the years of terrible persecution from 1660 to 1688, combatted the theory in a number of able documents as well as by their active opposition to the reigning prince. At the time of the American Revolution there were several thousand Tories in this country who opposed the war for Independence partly on the ground of the alleged divine right of George III.

It is often said to-day that this untenable doctrine has been entirely abandoned, or that if held at all it is held in a very mild form. It is commonly thought however that the theory

is still held in Germany, Austria and Russia. Inasmuch as this is one of the points involved in the questions raised by our correspondent considered in the preceding article, and since it was found to be too large a question to be considered at length in that article, it is taken up now for the purpose of stating the essential facts as far as may be necessary.

After the close of the Napoleonic wars a Holy Alliance was formed between the Czar of Russia, the King of Prussia and the Emperor of Austria. It is dated November 20th, 1815. The second article of this treaty is commonly held to set forth the doctrine of the divine right of kings. The paragraph touching this matter is in these words: "In consequence, the sole principle of force, whether between the said governments or between their subjects, shall be that of doing each other reciprocal service, and of testifying by unalterable good will the mutual affection with which they ought to be animated, to consider themselves all as members of one and the same Christian nation; the three allied Princes looking on themselves as merely delegated by Providence to govern three branches of the one family, namely Austria, Prussia, and Russia." It is true that the expression "delegated by Providence to govern" etc., may be interpreted in such manner as to mean something entirely different from what is usually understood by divine right. But when the well-known doctrine commonly held in that and the preceding period is considered it is almost necessary to understand this language to mean that these reigning princes considered themselves to be chosen out from the rest of mankind and clothed with a special sovereign right to rule.

But it is of chief interest to us to know the theory held today by such writers as Heinrich von Treitschke. Here is what he says: "The claim to rule 'by the grace of God' is no more than a devout aspiration which does not attempt to formulate a mystical and spiritual right to power, but simply to assert that the inscrutable will of Providence has decreed the elevation of a particular family above its rivals. Piety is a fundamental requirement in a monarch, since the notion that he stands immeasurably above all other men may actually unsettle his reason, if it be not balanced by personal humility which compels him to acknowledge himself God's instrument. All this does not abrogate the axiom that it is the nature and aim of monarchy to be of this world. Genuine monarchy does not aspire to partnership with the Almighty." "It is only a secondary feature of monarchy that in it authority resides in the will of a single individual; the primary consideration is that this authority is not delegated but original and inherent in him. One may, to use an expression familiar to the schoolmen, speak of the **aseitas** of royal authority, and the fact that this authority is self-derived produces a much higher level of social justice under monarchy than under any known form of republic." (Vol. II. pp. 58, 59). Just what some of these expressions mean may not be quite clear to the average reader. Some of them appear innocent enough and may seem really to negative the idea of the divine right of the emperor. For example the statement that royal authority bears a temporal stamp, that the nature and aim of monarchy are of this world, that the monarch does not aspire to partnership with the Almighty, seem to imply that German views of political author-

ity are much the same as those of England or the United States. But even the few quotations from Treitschke in this and the preceding article show that he is not a consistent writer and that in striving to harmonize his theory of monarchy with present day ideas of liberty he gives expression to statements that cannot possibly be harmonized with one another. While he denies that the expression "by the grace of God" contains the idea of a mystical or spiritual right to power, he certainly teaches that the emperor is elevated by the will of Providence above all rivals. Lest this might be understood to mean no more than might be implied in the statement that certain men in a republic are elevated by the will of providence to places of power, it should be observed that he says that a particular family is so chosen and elevated, that his authority is not delegated but is inherent, and that we may even speak of the **aseitas** of royal authority. If these expressions are to be taken at their full value they mean vastly more than has usually been meant by the divine right of kings. This phrase has a fixed historical meaning, which is that God has set apart certain families and individuals to whom he has delegated the right to rule over the rest of mankind, has clothed them with the royal prerogative, and has bestowed upon them the necessary equipment to rule. Treitschke maintains all this in some parts of his work, but in the quotation now under review he seems to go much farther. He speaks of the **aseitas** of royal authority. This is a theological term and was used by the Scholastics to denote that the being and attributes of God are not derived from any source outside himself. The aseity of God's authority means that it is not derived from some other being. When Treitschke speaks of the aseity of the monarch's authority he seems to place him on an equality with God himself. At all events that is the strict and proper meaning of his language. But we will refrain from attributing to Treitschke such a blasphemous idea. Then he must mean nothing short of the doctrine of the divine right of the monarch in the medieval sense. He denies most strenuously that he gets his authority from or through the people. He says that he is exalted above his rivals by the will of Providence. He declares that while in a republic authority is founded on the will of the people, in a monarchy it is derived from the historical claim of a particular family and concentrated in the will of one man who wears the crown and decides every question himself.

Doubtless there are many Germans who do not believe all this. Democratic ideas have made great progress in Germany. It has been thought by some that the war was brought about partly for the purpose of counteracting this democratic tendency. It is fondly hoped that it will turn out rather in the interest of free government if not for the complete overthrow of monarchy.

* * *

Legislation the design of which is not to fix the character of the Sabbath but to assure the fact of the rest day, ought to have a high place in thought and effort. A proper statute is a necessity for Sabbath defense. It is a charter of liberty to the sons of toil with respect to the weekly rest day. The law will not make the Sabbath any more than a fence will make a garden, but as a fence, when depredating animals are abroad, makes a garden possible, so the law makes the Sabbath of our ideals possible.—**Rochester.**

Special Articles

THE BASIS OF NATIONAL REFORM

James S. Martin, M. A.

National Reform is the term applied to the movement that has for its object the thorough and complete Christianization of the nation. It therefore has to do with the nation, as such. It has to do also with the great moral problems affecting the life and character of the nation and with which the nation as such must deal—such as marriage and divorce, the Sabbath, the character of public education, intemperance, Mormonism, and the like. Furthermore, it has to do preeminently with those great fundamental principles of Christian civil government, clearly and explicitly taught in the Word of God, advocated by practically all great political philosophers the world over, and attested by the events of history from time almost immemorial.

God the ultimate source of all civil authority, Jesus Christ the divinely appointed ruler of nations, the will of God as it relates to nations revealed through Christ and contained in the Scriptures—these are the bed-rock principles on which the movement is founded.

Not man, but God is the source of civil authority. "There is no power," no real civil authority, "but of God. The powers that be are ordained of God." The authority exercised by nations is a demonstration of this. The nation electrocutes or hangs by the neck a man until he is dead, or sends him out upon the battle-field, either with or without his consent, there to lay down his life if need be for his country. No man can give life, or no body of men, and no man or body of men have a right to take away that which they cannot give.

It is God who brings nations into being, God who guides and governs nations, God who blesses or curses, saves or destroys nations according to the attitude they bear to Him. His dealings with Egypt, Babylon, the Canaanites, the Israelites, Greece, Rome, and other nations of the past, all attest this. True, He invests the people, in the last analysis—one and all—with the divine right to rule themselves, but He remains the ultimate source of all the authority they exercise and, in the very nature of the case, holds them responsible for the manner in which they exercise it. "Government of the people, by the people and for the people" is political **heresy,** unless there be added, "under God." This then is the first foundation stone of National Reform—God the ultimate source of all civil authority.

The second is the national rulership of Jesus Christ. God who is the ultimate source of all civil authority hath **delegated** this authority to His Son Jesus Christ. The latter is the one Mediator between God and man in **all** life's relations. I repeat, **Jesus Christ** is the King of nations. In Holy Writ He is explicitly called "The King of nations," "the Governor among the nations," "the Prince of the kings of the earth," "the King of kings and Lord of lords." Furthermore, He Himself asserts that He possesses this authority. "All authority," He says, "hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth." **Without** this authority

He never could succeed in His work as Savior. Without it He never could control the hostile civil forces that so ofttimes array themselves against Him and His work. Without it, His redemptive work would be incomplete. Still further, the Scriptures explicitly declare that God the Father has delegated this authority over nations to His Son. "Wherefore," (that is as the result of His humbling Himself unto death,) "God also hath highly exalted Him and given Him a name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things **on earth**—and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." Not czar, or emperor, or king or queen, or president even; not pope or prophet, but Jesus Christ is the rightful ruler of nations. And blessed are the nations which "kiss the son," which do Him homage, "lest He be angry and they perish from the way."

It is worthy of note that the Scriptures, from which alone we can determine Christ's relation to nations, declare that He is **now** their rightful Ruler and that they ought to bow to Him. The very tenses of the verbs employed indicate this. All things **are** put under Him; all authority **hath been given** unto Him; He **is** the Prince of the kings of the earth; He **is** King of kings; nations and their rulers are commanded to be wise **now** and kiss the Son. What is yet future is the willing submission of nations. He is already seated upon His throne and is using His authority for the accomplishment of His purposes, overruling evil for good and making the very wrath of men to praise Him.

If it be **historical** evidence of Christ's rulership of nations that is wanted, see it in the world-wide proclamation of the Gospel in the days of the apostles; in the fall of the Roman Empire; in the reformation period with its world of important events; in the founding of the American Republic by Protestant Christians; in the overthrow of slavery in this and other lands; in the rapidly rising tide of outraged public sentiment against Mormonism, "the twin relic of barbarism," as Abraham Lincoln called it; in the present-day onward march toward national, even world-wide, prohibition of the liquor traffic; in the moral code of our own and other nations against blasphemy, profanity, theft, murder, perjury, the desecration of the Lord's Day, licentiousness and so forth; in the formation of various reform organizations whose special purpose it is to bear witness against the sins and rectify the wrongs of nations; in the chronicle of missionary events in the Orient, in Africa, in the South Sea Islands, in practically all lands indeed; and in the present-day movement to evangelize the entire world. Aye, the kingdoms of this world **are becoming** the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.

The third foundation pillar of the National Reform movement is the supremacy of the divine will as the rule of national life and the standard of national action. Not the will of the people, independent of or contrary to the will of the Lord, but His will expressed **through** and **by** the people is the supreme rule of national life. And the nation that fails to recognize and heed this truth runs square into the teeth of God.

The first and paramount question to be considered in reference to any national act or policy is—not is it **expedient,** but is it **right?** God's law for nations forbids any nation going to

war to enlarge its territory, increase its trade or enhance its prestige among the nations. It forbids any nation itself to carry on worldly business or permit the carrying on of such business on the Lord's Day. It forbids the breaking up of families for other than the God-given reason of infidelity—adultery. It forbids the licensing of such a thing as the accursed traffic in intoxicating drinks. It forbids the secularization of the country's training schools for citizenship. It forbids the toleration of such an imperial, despotic, blasphemous oligarchy as the Mormon hierarchy in our Republic. It requires the nation itself to yield manifest obedience to the moral laws of God; to enact laws in harmony with the laws of God; to educate its youth in the knowledge and fear of God; to choose God-fearing men to fill its legislative, judicial and executive offices. In short, it requires just what, at the outset, we said National Reform is—a movement thoroughly and completely to Christianize the nation.

And just here is the point at which it is broadly and fundamentally differentiated from any and all other reform movements. It regards the great national evils that prevail in our midst not simply as **evils** but as **sins**—sins which provoke the wrath of God and call down His judgments and which must needs be repented of, if the nation's life is to be preserved. The object of the tens of thousands of Christian patriots of every name engaged in this reform is to have this great nation of ours—the moral and responsible entity that it is—confess its sins to God and beg forgiveness for the same through Jesus Christ the Savior-King of nations as well as of men; openly own Him as its rightful Lord and Ruler; and henceforth pledge itself to obedience to His will, in the light of which and by the application of which to all its great moral problems it will solve these problems and serve its purpose in the ultimate establishment of the kingdom of God and the securing of His will done on earth as it is in heaven.

Ah yes, this is the movement that writes upon the banners of reform the Name that is above every name, this the movement that holds aloft the Lord Jesus Christ before the nation that He may draw it to Himself, this the movement that exalts the cross as well as the crown and declares that by these signs we shall conquer, and by these alone.

All this we must as a nation do if we would save ourselves from the fate of the nations that have forgotten God and whom God has left to themselves to bite and devour one another—even as our neighbors across the ocean this very hour. Where is the student of history who will dare to deny that these nations are today paying the penalty of national sin—down even to little Belgium?

Oh, how this our beloved America needs, in this crucial hour of world cataclysm, to right herself with the God of nations—to purge herself of her national sins ere her day of judgment comes; to plant herself fairly, squarely and openly on the side of the Lord and His Anointed; and unequivocally to say so, in her highest written law, that there can be no possible mistaking or gainsaying of it!

Militarism has failed and will fail to right wrongs, save nations and lead them to the fulfillment of their destiny under God. Reform movements galore based upon mere expediency, economy, humanitarianism even, have failed and will fail. Social service,

about which we hear so much these days, apart from Christ and His will, has failed and will fail. Jesus Christ is the very heart of all social amelioration. The will of God is the one fixed standard of right and wrong for nations as well as for men. The Lord God Himself, who holds in His hands the destiny of nations as well as of men, is the ultimate source of all civil authority. His authority must be recognized and acknowledged. His will must be done. His Son must be kissed—shown all due homage by the nations if they are to survive even, to say nothing of fulfilling the mission for which they have been brought into being.

And what a grave need there is at this hour that Christians band themselves together as citizens in a definite, coherent movement to save the nation and lead it to the fulfillment of its high destiny as an agency in the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth, even as they band themselves together as ecclesiasts to save the church and aid it as an agency in its sphere to the same glorious end!

Pittsburgh, Pa.

♣ ♣ ♣

WHY SOME REFORMS FAIL

William Melville Curry

Every reform must rest on the truth of God as revealed in Christ, before it can wield any power in a world under the rule of God. The confusion that arises in much of modern reform work is traceable to this fundamental mistake. We are living in times in which the word reform is on everybody's lips. Most everyone believes in reform. But there are those who are discouraged at the progress reform is making, or at the failure of reform and become prophets of pessimism. The real truth is that only confusion can result from the success of many of the so-called modern reforms, because they depart from the program of God and ignore fundamental moral considerations. It is a time when the church of Christ needs to speak in no uncertain voice. For the sake of the future, her message needs to be distinct.

One of my old teachers in the university used to insist that the throne of God was the astronomical center of the universe. Maybe it is. That would certainly account for the stability of things. But that He has constituted the moral universe, with Himself as the center, can admit of no doubt in the mind of anyone who has seen the moral order from the point of view of the revealed Word. Our planet is no more dependent on the sun than our moral life on God. Without Him the soul is a wandering star and life is, morally, as Milton described it, physically, after he sank into blindness,

"Dark, dark, irrecoverably dark."

The only alternative to a God-centered life is the life of self-will. The man of self-will simply leaves God out of his account. He makes the chief end of man to glorify and enjoy himself forever. He leaves God out. Emerson said, "A hero is a man who is immovably centered." A Christian is a man or woman who is immovably centered on Christ. The Psalmist expressed a perfectly normal and healthy aspiration of an instructed mind,

> "My soul is longing, fainting,
> Jehovah's courts to see;
> My heart and flesh are crying,
> O Living God for Thee."

The state and the social organization succeed or fail as the individual.

The one thing that is thwarting reform, that is real and vital, is the elimination of the Bible from its rightful place. The Bible is not incidental in our civilization, in the thought of God. Any man that attempts to get through life without a knowledge of the Word of God, will attempt a hard thing with a fatal handicap. Any civilization or social order will find its goal obscured in mist and its path uncertain, for the same reason. One of the greatest of all rulers said, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path." When Israel left God out of account the "wanderings" began, whether inside or outside the promised land. Without the Bible we cannot know God. The moral view of life is dissipated in innumerable isms and the way of men and nations is an uncertain path.

Carlyle said, "The beginning and the end of what is the matter with us in these days is that we are forgetting God." He was speaking of other times and lands, but his diagnosis fits our condition to-day in America. Moses said, "Beware . . . lest when thou hast eaten and art full, and hast built goodly houses and dwelt therein, and when thy herds and thy flocks multiply and thy silver and thy gold is multiplied, and all that thou hast is multiplied, then thy heart be lifted up and thou forget the Lord thy God." Moses does not condemn the full dinner pail. He is not overlooking the benefit of good housing but he is warning against a misplacing of emphasis. The preface to the moral law is, "I am the Lord thy God." Prosperity is the will of God for men. Riches are the favor of God. God wants our tables to be well provided and our presses to burst out with new wine. But all that the earth has to give by way of good houses and good lands and great prosperity are a perversion, if men forget God. The beginning and the end of the new order must be the recognition of God. In His light we can see light. When we recognize Him, we will recognize the right of a brother.

This brings me to say that the Gospel of Christ is the very heart of all social amelioration. Any program that is worth following must begin or end here. The "man" question is the great question. Get the man's heart right and you will have his conduct right. Get the men on the board of directors right and the program of the board of directors will be right. Get the men of the labor unions right and their demands and their program will be right. Any other method is superficial and will come to nothing as they have come to nothing in the weary path by which the races have come. No Christian having the Mind of Christ but has seen the injustice in human society. It obtrudes itself into one's consciousness. It forces its entrance into the mind. But the man who has seen with the eye of the Christ, the vision splendid of the city of God coming down out of heaven, has not any doubt of the way the world must travel for her redemption. The citizenship of the world must come to the program of the Christ.

Militarism has failed and will fail. Labor guilds have failed and will fail. Social service, apart from Christ and His Gospel, has failed and will fail. The regeneration of the world, of our social order, rife with hate and frightful inhumanity, can come and will come through the incarnation of God, once manifested in Christ, in every social order. That makes men one in

Christ Jesus. What our day needs above all other needs is a new emphasis on the old Gospel. We do not need the preaching of ancient theologies or creeds, but we do need and must have the Gospel of Christ applied to our modern problems. It is still the power of God unto salvation. It alone can put success into a program, for it brings love in and justice and God. And the beginning and the end of our labor and all other social problems is that we are forgetting God and we riot and commit injustice in His world.

We are in the dispensation of the Spirit and He will lead men who will listen and follow, as definitely as He led Israel in the olden time. But His program must prevail.

Trenton, N. J.

♣ ♣ ♣

WHERE EUGENICS FAIL

Horace S. Foster

Just now the principle of Eugenics is being discussed by many and in some States it is being applied in the granting of marriage licenses. There is great danger of this principle being carried too far. Both love and attraction must prevail if the desired results pertain. Love, real old-fashioned love of man for woman must prevail or the best evolved system of theoretic eugenics will prove a failure. Love must be the dominating force between husband and wife if the offspring are to be perfect. This may attain and one or the other be physically deficient. It can not attain where love is lacking.

In proof of this let us take a look at a community where love has been the least considered in effecting marriage. Among the early Mormons were many powerful and brainy men. They were men of force and action in which the rigors of the elements, in battling, brought forth every quality that is needed to make for a vigorous manhood. During the early days, polygamy was taught and practiced. The women were chosen for their certain qualities as though the men were fitting up a stock farm. But who can name the progeny of Brigham Young? Where are his children and what per cent of them can make a living for themselves if forced to the outer world to earn a livelihood? What about the children and grandchildren of a score or more of others who were known to have had as many as six or more?

Take the Cannon family. George Q. Cannon next to Brigham Young was the most powerful in the church. Not only was he a leader of men but he was a man of accomplishments, well educated, a literary man; in fact had he not been drawn into polygamy he would have unquestionably been Utah's redeemer. Of his large family one, and one only, has ever risen above the mediocre, and he is devoting his life to undoing the things that his father did, trying to make amends and to bring his people back to the Lord and to forego their idols.

Another big man among the early Mormons was Lorin W. Farr. He was a leader and, taken altogether as between man and man, was always on the square. Six wives graced his name and six offspring came to each home. All these children came to maturity in the homes where they were born. Notwithstanding the great ability of the father, not one of his many children has ever risen even to a point of leadership either in church, business or politics.

From every point of view, polygamy is wrong. It has not a single redeeming feature and those who say it has either do not know or are trying to deceive others.

The writer has nothing but the kindliest of feelings for the Mormons; for ten years of his life was spent among them and some of the dearest friends he has are of that faith. But they are being misled. Unless there is a change in their attitude towards the customs of this country—and there appears to be no ray of hope along this line—the strong arm of this government will need to be invoked again; and when it comes again we predict that the great temple with all its mysteries will become the property of the government and the central figure of a great museum, and the great statue of Brigham Young will no longer stand at the head of the street as a man to be emulated. No longer will the pretty young women and bright young men stand in the temple grounds giving out misinformation pertaining to the teachings and practices of the Mormon people. From the walls of its school houses will be removed the pictures of Parley L. Pratt, B. H. Roberts, and a hundred polygamous priests, put there to impress the minds and lives of the young children. And, if need be, in order to insure the building up of an American State where now the Mormon hierarchy stands, the right of suffrage will be restricted to Americans only.

Back to the subject. We think that some restrictions should be placed on the issuing of marriage licenses. We do not think the physically unfit should reproduce their kind under any and all circumstances. But while we are legislating along this line we predict total and complete failure where marriage is based on anything other than mutual love and admiration, each for the other. The Mormon question puts the quietus on the idea that physical fitness is in itself sufficient.

Wagoner, Okla.

* * *

RELIGION AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

E. W. Rumsey

(continued from December number)

It is true there have been many who have thought to solve the problem of moral and religious training in some other way. Some of the plans proposed have been tried and have met with a measure of success and public approval. The one we hear of most frequently is known as the GARY PLAN, so-called because it originated in Gary, Indiana. It has since been experimented with in New York City. This plan does not make any arrangements for religious instruction; it simply affords time for it. The pupils are excused from the public school one afternoon each week, in order to give them the opportunity of attending religious instruction in the churches. No religious instruction is given in the public school buildings; no records of the work done in the church schools is kept by the public school; no agreement is entered into by the public school authorities with the religious bodies. Under some of the other plans that have been tried, however, such as the North Dakota Plan and the Colorado Plan, credits are given by the public schools to pupils for Bible study done outside of school.

Now these plans to promote moral and religious instruction of course are an improvement over the conditions

that generally prevail. Any plan that in any degree supplies the present lack is that. But to all of them there are several fatal **objections:** (1) **One afternoon each week is not enough** to meet the need for religious instruction. (2) **None of these plans makes provision for the moral training of those who need it most.** As attendance upon such instruction would be voluntary the children of irreligious and vicious citizens would not attend. The plan therefore breaks down where it should be strongest. For example, a recent investigator of the Colorado Plan informs us that in the few towns where the plan is actually being put into operation only about 15% of the high school pupils had availed themselves of such privileges. And this under a system where inducements are offered by the high schools in the way of credits for the work done! How will it work out under the Gary Plan and other plans where no such inducements are offered? And if any one would remedy this serious defect by making attendance upon the church classes compulsory, he at once proposes a remedy worse than the disease by advocating the union of church and state. (3) Furthermore, all of these proposed plans **overlook the real nature of religion and do violence to the nature of the child.** Mr. Joseph S. Taylor, District Superintendent of Schools in New York City, in a report on the Gary System as used there, says: "How to separate secular from religious instruction in our democratic form of government, so as to provide for a sufficient amount of each form of instruction for the full and harmonious development of the child, is a problem which educators have tried to solve for many years." The great mistake Mr. Taylor and the other educators he refers to have made is in trying to separate the two or in supposing that they really could be separated. The distinction between secular and religious is after all an artificial distinction. And religion has to do with the whole life of the child as well as of the adult and cannot be shut up in a water-tight compartment of his being. The whole child goes to school, not merely his intellectual nature. He cannot be educated in sections. No part of his nature can be safely ignored during school hours. (4) And lastly, all these **proposed plans are mere subterfuges** and do not propose to make the schools themselves what they ought to be, namely, the great governmental agency for the training of an upright citizenship. The state has a religious duty to perform. Her own safety and perpetuity, as well as the welfare of her future citizens, demand it. Fourteen million youth in the United States never darken a church door! The public school is the only adequate agency for reaching the unchurched masses and instilling into them the fundamental principles upon which the safety and well-being of the nation depend. The state alone possesses the necessary equipment; she alone can raise the necessary funds; she alone can compel attendance upon the instruction which she sees fit to give. She alone must furnish us the solution of this great problem through her public school system.

But what then, someone asks, becomes of our cherished principle of the separation of church and state? Here is the crux of the whole controversy. If there is one thing the American people are united on more than on any other, it is the principle of the complete separation of church and state. And this principle is regarded by all

secularists, whether Christians, Jews or agnostics, as forbidding the state to give religious instruction. The oft-repeated statement, "The state cannot teach religion," has become an axiom the truth of which has been taken for granted. Most of our reasoning on the subject of moral and religious training has started with this as a premise. But in so important a matter as the subject before us, we cannot afford to take anything for granted. And if we subject this generally accepted axiom to honest inquiry we may be surprised to find ourselves convinced that it is a great mistake. The principle of the separation of church and state we all accept. But the assumption that this forbids the state to teach religion does not necessarily follow. In fact I have become convinced that it is a wrong application of a right principle. And this misapprehension is due to a misunderstanding of the nature of the state and to a failure to discriminate between the church and religion. The church is an institution, the state is an institution, and while both may be and are largely made up of the same individuals, these two institutions, as such, are and ought to be entirely distinct and separate. But the church is not religion. Religion is not an institution but it is a life. As such it has to do with all a man's activities and relationships. The assumption that men can lay aside their religious character when they act politically is a fallacy. Furthermore, there is an indissoluble connection between religious life and national life. So much so, in fact, that the religious life of the nation determines the character of the nation, its ideals and its institutions. Hegel says in his Philosophy of History: "The idea of God constitutes the general foundation of a people. Whatever is the form of a religion, the same is the form of a state and its constitution; it springs from religion, so much so that the Athenian and the Roman states were possible only with the peculiar heathenism of those people, and that even now a Roman Catholic state has a different genius and a different constitution from a Protestant state." Does anyone doubt the truth of Hegel's contention? Will anyone deny that American ideals and institutions are the natural result of the religious life of American Protestantism? It follows logically that each nation has a religious history as well as a history of purely political institutions. Or rather the entire history of a nation is the history of institutions which invariably have a religious origin, are moulded by religion, and are themselves characterized by religious attributes. Here are essential and fundamental facts which ought to be taken into account by anyone who investigates this problem of religion and the public school.

The government of the United States is by no means atheistic or unreligious. The Supreme Court of the United States, on the basis of overwhelming evidence, has declared that this is a Christian nation. By act of congress we have issued a declaration of our national faith and scattered it broadcast throughout the land; read it on our coins, "In God We Trust." Our government employs chaplains in the army and navy, in congress, and in its penal institutions. The oath is administered to those who are placed in official position as well as to those who bear testimony in our courts, and its violation is held to be a serious criminal offence. Opinions might be cited from Judge Story, Daniel Webster, Chief Justice Shea, and others, showing that Christianity is a part of the common

law of the land. Speaking of the time when the Constitution was adopted, Judge Story says, "The attempt to level all religions, and make it a matter of state policy to hold all in utter indifference, would have created universal disapprobation, if not universal indignation." Again the Supreme Court has declared that "honesty, morality, religion and education are the main pillars of the state, for the protection and promotion of which government was instituted among men." The principle of the separation of church and state unquestionably forbids sectarian instruction in the public schools, but we have the highest legal and judicial authority for saying that it does not prohibit undenominational religious instruction. There are religious principles which are purely national and in no sense ecclesiastical, and these the state may and ought to teach. To omit the religious element in the education of its youth is to be derelict in its duty and untrue to its own genius.

But does not any kind of religious instruction violate the rights of infidels and agnostics, who do not accept the fundamental principles of American Christianity and who object to these principles being taught to their children? This question brings us to the ground on which rests the right of the state to teach fundamental religious truth. What right has the state to take money from your pocket to educate your neighbor's child? It is not because education is a good thing for the child but because his ignorance is a bad thing for the state. Possibly the father is proud of his ignorance and does not approve of schooling for his boy. But the state does not consult the ideas or preferences of the parent. Because illiteracy is dangerous to free institutions, the state takes that boy from the plow against the protest of his father and puts him in school. But immorality is as dangerous to liberty as illiteracy, in fact, a great deal more so. If, therefore, fundamental religious truth is essential to moral training, the state has precisely the same right to teach the child that there is a God that it has to teach him to read and write, even though it be against the protest of his father. The secular program exaggerates the rights of minorities. It is impossible to devise any system of government under which no one will be obliged to pay for the support of some things to which he objects on conscientious grounds. The army and navy are supported and costly battleships are built with money taken from the public treasury, although there are many people in the country who are opposed to preparedness. So long as no one is compelled to make a profession of what he does not believe and is protected in the enjoyment of his right to disbelieve he has no right to complain. The minority have not the right to veto everything to which they object in the policy of a government. In other words, the right to teach religion rests in the police power of the state. Daniel Webster speaks of the public school as "a wise and liberal system of police, by which property and life and the peace of society are secured." He declares that this end is sought by such instruction as will "purify the whole moral atmosphere, keep good sentiments uppermost, and turn the strong current of feeling and opinion, as well as the censures of the law and the denunciations of religion against immorality and crime."

Even if it were not true that religion is essential as a foundation to a logical system of ethics, the fact remains that

public school children do not need to be taught merely a system of ethics. What they do need is effective moral training. Such training must be directed to the will and not merely to the intellect and it must have adequate motives. Children who lie do so not because they are unaware that it is wrong, but because they have not sufficient motive to resist the temptation. With the great majority a sufficient motive can be furnished only by an appeal to fundamental religious truth. This might be sustained by the weightiest testimony, but the well-known words of Washington's farewell address must suffice: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

The secular program would make havoc of the public school curriculum. Not only would it exclude the Bible and all formal religious exercises, but if carried out to its logical conclusion it would also exclude patriotic songs which contain religious sentiments. It would exclude the Star Spangled Banner, which contains the words, "In God is our trust." It would exclude America, which contains the stanza:

"Our fathers' God, to Thee,
Author of liberty,
To Thee we sing.
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King."

Furthermore, this program, if logically carried out, would emasculate our literature, which is full of religious allusions, nay more, it would mutilate our very language itself, which is the language of a religious people containing numerous words expressive of religious ideas. It is impossible now to reconstruct our language so as to conform it to this secular program unless the people who speak it are first reconstructed. Secularists are several thousand years too late in getting started to get their plan into successful operation without friction. Men should have been made without religious natures so that they would not have any religious ideas requiring religious words for their expression. And what is to be done with the religious element in American history? It is too late to secularize it now. Imagine anyone trying to secularize Plymouth Rock, or the cabin of the Mayflower! Every period of our history has its religious features and one does not know history if the religious element is omitted. In fact if we attempt to remove every trace of religion from that which is taught in our public schools, we would have little or nothing left. Religion concerns all life. All this world belongs to God and there is nothing secular. To distinguish between the secular and the sacred is practical atheism—to banish God from his world. Hence to keep religion out of

the public schools is impossible, and to teach God in and through his works appears both easy and inevitable.

Finally, if it be seen that religion is service, that to love God is to serve man, that duty to the public, and, above all, performance of that duty in the impressionable and needy years of the child, is both the highest privilege and the duty of man, then the conception of the duties, privileges and responsibilities of the public school teacher assumes the highest religious form and ought to lead to the highest results. With the following quotation from President Eliot of Harvard, I close:

"The masses of the people must be taught to use their reason, to seek the truth, and to love justice and mercy. There is no safety for democratic society in truth held, or justice loved, by the few; The millions must mean to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with their God. The millions must be taught to discuss, not fight; to trust publicity, not secrecy; and to take timely public precautions against every kind of selfish oppression. To give this instruction steadily and universally society possesses no organized agency which compares in present efficiency and future promise with the schools."

Pitcairn, Pa.

The National Reform Movement

SPARKS FROM THE NATIONAL REFORM ANVIL

By the Managing Editor

The United States is **nominally** a Christian nation. National Reform would make it **really** so.

The preservation, development, perfecting and perpetuating of what is truly Christian in our national life and character—by some termed our national Christianity—is, in brief, what is meant by National Reform.

National Reform, as the term itself indicates, is national in its scope and character. It has to do with the nation, as such. Moreover, it implies that the nation is not wholly bad. It is not the **revolution** of the nation, but its **reformation** that is sought by National Reformers. It must therefore have in it great worth and merit. That is why it is worthy of being reformed and securely saved.

National Reform regards the nation not as an organization merely but as an organism possessing life, intelligence, volition, consciousness and conscience, and therefore a responsible being—responsible to God its Creator and to Jesus Christ its divinely appointed Ruler, and amenable to the law of God, revealed through Christ, in so far as this law relates to national life.

The constant aim of National Reform is to have the nation, as such, accept God's law as the rule of its life and the standard of its action, and thus be in a position to make the application of the divine law to the solution of all its great moral problems and in the administration of all its affairs.

National Reform would have the nation, the great moral entity that it is, not only procure forgiveness for its sins and so continue for the present its life, prosperity and usefulness, but openly and publicly pledge henceforth obedience to Jesus Christ and His law, that it may prolong to the end of time

its existence, make permanent its prosperity and marvelously enhance its usefulness. And this it would have the nation do not only in its vital or unwritten constitution (that is, in its customs, usages, laws and institutions) but also in its formal, written constitution.

National Reform differs from other moral and religious reforms in that it includes all of them, in so far as they affect civil and political life, and deals with them chiefly in the most fundamental manner—enunciating and emphasizing the Christian or Bible principles of civil government, the acceptance and practice of which alone will make these reforms really successful; also in that it aims to have the nation cast off not **one** but **all** of its sins and so link itself with Him Who sits upon the throne that it may claim His power and help in the solution of its problems and in the fulfillment of its mission to aid in the establishment of **the kingdom** of God.

We are having striking lessons these times of the responsibility of nations one to the other. And does anyone imagine for a moment that nations are less responsible to the God that brought them into being, upon whom they are dependent for their continued existence, and to whom they must render account for their every act? Oh that the nations of the earth would but realize this truth and govern themselves accordingly! It would indeed be a **new** day for them.

A nation needs the Lord Jesus Christ to guide, govern, bless and save it temporally (it has no eternal existence) just as certainly as a man needs Him to guide, govern, bless and save him temporally and eternally. Christ deals with His creatures according to their natures, each after its own nature.

Civil government is God's ordinance and civil rulers are God's ministers. Such is the explicit teaching of Holy Writ. What an absurdity it therefore is to elect to civil office, to administer God's ordinance, men who have not the fear of God in their hearts and no reverent regard for His law!

Much depends upon the spirit in which we engage in the work of National Reform. This work ought to be done lovingly, earnestly, prayerfully. It is one thing to testify against the sins of the nation. Not a few are experts at that. It is quite another and very different thing to bear the nation before God lovingly, believingly, with passionate fervency of desire as Moses did: "Oh, this people have sinned a great sin; yet now, if thou wilt, forgive their sin—and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written;" as Samuel who said: "God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you;" as John Knox said in his outburst of soul: "Lord, give me Scotland or I die;" and, when denied, to lament as the Master Himself did over Jerusalem: "O, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings and ye would not." If we have not this spirit, if such prayers are not habitual with us, we should confess our sins before God, fall upon our knees and implore Him to give us the true spirit of Christian patriots.

Here is a verse penned by someone with reference to foreign mission work but which is quite as applicable to the work of National Reform:

I know of a land that is sunk in shame,
Of hearts that faint and tire:
But I know of a name, a name, a name,
Can set that land on fire.
I know of a name, a name, a name,
Will set that land on fire.

♣ ♣ ♣

When we say that the nation is a moral person we mean that it has its own entity, its own consciousness, its own intelligence, its own volition, and conscience, and responsibility; that it is under the law of God, and is held responsible by the Governor among nations.

OUR PEACE DEPARTMENT

By the Assistant Superintendent

"PUT UP THY SWORD"

The Christian solution of the problem of war is found in the substitution of reason for force, of arbitration for armaments, of good will for suspicion. The dream of world peace is a practical one. What has been accomplished among individuals can be done among nations. Personal quarrels are no longer settled by physical violence. The duel and the feud are not now, as they once were, recognized methods of settling disputes. The manufacture of rapiers did not stop duelling. Nor will the manufacture of weapons of war stop war. Duelling was stopped by the disapproval of society whose peace was disturbed by that practice. War disturbs the peace of mankind. It will be stopped, not by armaments, but by the edicts of mankind which will drive its terrors from civilized society and make it an Ishmael among the nations.

The years of feudalism were also years of feuds; castle against castle, baron against baron, knight against knight. But co-operation was found to be better than constant conflict. The knight of old has become the bandit of to-day. The feudist is regarded as a nuisance and a danger not only by the family of his enemy, but by society, and is suppressed.

War, too, is now recognized as disturbing the peace of society. Nations are now so closely linked by invention and commerce that there is no remote corner of the world where the effects of war are not felt. Nations can no longer go "swashbuckling" without injury to the peace of mankind.

Therefore society must suppress war by organized effort and that upon a Christian basis if there is to be any permanent peace.

The plan for world peace adopted by the National Reform Association is rational and practical as well as Christian.

It proposes:

1. A world wide call for national obedience to Christ, based on his kingship over nations, governments and rulers.
2. A campaign on the part of the Christian pulpit everywhere on the necessity for permanent peace.
3. An effort on the part of the American nation to mediate for peace at the earliest possible moment.
4. National as well as personal contributions to aid the war sufferers of all nations.
5. The establishment of an international Peace Tribunal to which all international difficulties must be referred before recourse is made to force.
6. A League of the Nations for Peace.
7. An International Police Force for the preservation of order in the world.
8. The limitation of national appropriations for military purposes.
9. The disarmament of all battleships and disbanding of all armies not needed for the composition of an international police force or for the preservation of internal peace.
10. The cessation of the manufacture of all military implements except as above implied.
11. Provision for systematic instruction in the public schools as to the misery, injustice and economic waste of war.

Such a program, if it is carried out, will relegate war to the scrap-heap among the other "relics of barbarism."

* * *

THE DOOM OF WAR

We are in the midst of two great campaigns. They are of greater importance to mankind than the assaults on Verdun were to Germany. They are more vital to the welfare of humanity than the battle of the Marne was to France. They are waged against more

powerful and destructive foes than the central powers or the allies. The two great campaigns which humanity is now fighting are the battle against booze and the war on war.

Both go to certain victory. King Alcohol is doomed. God has decreed it. The prophet Habakkuk has declared it. When speaking of the liquor traffic, he asserts, "Because thou hast spoiled many nations, all the remnant of the people shall spoil thee; because of men's blood and for the violence done in the land, in the city and to all that dwell therein." In every nation the liquor forces are meeting defeat.

King Mars, too, will perish from the earth. God has promised it. The prophets, looking down the vistas of time, have seen the vision of a warless world. It is well for us to turn to God's Word. It heartens us when we feel discouraged and inclined to the belief that world peace is a poet's idle dream or a pacifist's mad desire.

This is the Word of the Lord, the sure voice of prophecy:

"He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth, he breaketh the bow and cutteth the spear in sunder; he burneth the chariot in the fire." Ps. 46:9.

"They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Is. 2:4.

"I will break the bow and the sword and the battle out of the earth and make them to lie down safely." Hosea 2:18.

"All the armor of the armed man in the tumult and the garments rolled in blood shall be for burning, for fuel of fire. For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end." Is. 9:5-8.

These and kindred passages make it certain that war will go, that this is the will of God. There is no doubt about the ultimate issue of the campaign to abolish war. There is no doubt that war is doomed to follow slavery, crucifixion, the duel, the feud, legalized gambling, opium and the liquor traffic into the company of that which civilization and Christianity condemns and bans.

But when will war cease? Not until the world grows sick of wars. Not until the nations realize that there is a better way. Not until the Christian world awakens to the fact that war is against the will of God and contrary to the spirit of Jesus. When the "government is upon his shoulder" who is the Prince of Peace, then will the dream of the poets be realized and the vision of the prophets be fulfilled.

Is this time near? Yes. The world is sick of war, never so sick as today. The nations now know that there is a better way than by force to settle their difficulties; that war never proves who is right, only which is stronger. And never before have Christians seen war with its mask off, as they do today, see it as the father of all evils, as the instigator to all cruelties, as the enemy of all liberties, as the foe of the church, as inimical to Christianity and as hostile to the Kingdom of Christ.

An awakened Christian conscience abolished slavery, the duel, the lottery and the opium traffic. These reforms were once declared impossible, yet they were accomplished. Shall the Christian world declare with unbelievers that to end war is impossible, when God is against war, when its evils have been made manifest by the greatest of all wars and when the victories of the past over ancient wrongs are before its eyes? Shall it not rather pray, "Thy will be done," and while it prays, speak, write, labor and sacrifice to abolish this child of hell, war, from among mankind?

♣ ♣ ♣

It has been well said that our perpendicular relationships must be adjusted before our horizontal relationships are. When men and nations get right with God, they will be right with one another.

THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST MORMONISM

MORMON POLITICAL EFFICIENCY

By the General Superintendent
of the National Reform Association

In a tone so significant that there can be no mistaking its meaning the question so ofttimes asked those leading the Crusade against Mormonism is, What can a million Mormons do in a country of a hundred million people? The answer is, nothing—if, like other people, the mass of them were distributed among the entire population of the country and were free to act as they please. Unfortunately, however, they are neither. On the contrary they are the constituent members of the most thoroughly organized and severely disciplined institution in the world —abject slaves of their ruling monarch and his associate leaders—and are concentrated and strategically located in the more sparsely settled portions of the West in such a way as to multiply their political power in our highest national legislative body to thirty-five times that of the inhabitants of the more thickly populated sections of the East.

It is only when we come to understand that the 1,400,000 people in the six Mormon politically controlled States of Utah, Idaho, Wyoming, Nevada, Arizona and New Mexico are represented in the United States Senate by twelve senators as against the six only that represent there the 21,000,000 people in New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania; only when we come to understand that these 1,400,000 with the additional 5,000,000 in the Mormon appreciably politically influenced States of Colorado, Montana, Washington, Oregon and California are represented in the Senate by twenty-two senators as against the six representing the 21,000,000 in the aforementioned Eastern States—it is only when we come to see this that we begin to realize the strategy of the Mormon leaders and the tremendous political power they wield in the highest councils of the nation. There has probably never been a time in the history of any man living when twenty-two senators did not hold the **balance of power** in the United States Senate. And **that** the Mormon hierarchs have at this very hour—else they never could have seated and never could hold in his seat there their oath-bound apostle in the face of the majority report of the United States Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections which explicitly and emphatically declares him to be in sworn disloyalty to our government and an alien ambassador of a hostile kingdom within our republic.

Nor is it at all necessary, as may seem on first thought, that there should be a numerical majority of Mormon voters in the Mormon controlled or appreciably influenced States to enable the leaders of this system to dominate State politics and get such a strong foothold in our national political life. It is quite sufficient to this end that they merely place enough of their votes in each State to hold a **balance** of political power. And the more evenly divided the population of any State is between the two great political parties, other things being equal the fewer Mormon voters are needed to constitute this balance of power. With

forty-nine per cent of the Gentile voters of a State in each of the great [illegible] but two per cent of Mormon voters are necessary to dictate to the leaders of both parties and give the victory in any election to whichever will promise the greatest favors to the Mormon manipulators.

In the above we are but reciting what has actually taken place and is all the while taking place within Mormondom, until within the past twenty years the Mormon kingdom has made most astounding political strides in our country—strides which if they are to continue unchecked for the next twenty years or for even half that period mean, in the light of the avowed aims and past history of the system, the **end** of any and all **peaceable** solution of the Mormon problem.

It is the organization, discipline, strategic handling of the million Mormons that makes them the national menace they are to our country—the very greatest indeed of our national menaces.

Pacific Christian Advocate,
Portland, Oregon.

THE MORMON SUBMARINE

By James S. Martin, M. A.

Mormonism is a veritable submarine. Its methods are underhanded. Its depth of intrigue is unparalleled. It is a wolf in sheep's clothing. Claiming to be a church, it is in fact an absolute monarchy. Under the cloak of religion, it both teaches and practices crime and treason. Pretending to be loyal to American institutions, it is in sworn disloyalty to our republic, with all that that involves.

SOCIAL

Its missionaries, to the number of over four thousand, go about the country visiting at least three million Christian homes each year, carefully concealing the real tenets of the system and capturing with false pretenses the half-baked people of evangelical faiths, until it draws them irretrievably into its meshes. According to its own claim, eighty thousand such were entrapped during the year 1915—all from evangelical churches. It never converted, never sought to convert, an atheist or an infidel. Its missionaries sing in choirs, teach in Sabbath schools, lead in missionary and young people's societies in the churches on the Lord's Day—in some instances for pay—and missionate among the members of these churches the remainder of the week. Its articles of faith, spread broadcast, present to the uninitiated everything but Mormonism. Its Key to Theology, carefully concealed from the masses, unfolds these articles and teaches them to the new converts in their blasphemous, sacrilegious, lascivious inwardness.

COMMERCIAL

It received a vast trust fund from the United States government with the explicit understanding and solemn pledge that the same would be used for distinctively charitable, benevolent and educational purposes for the

benefit of its own people, and today it has every dollar of that fund, which with its accretions amounts to over $400,000,000 of quick or mobile capital, invested in the great combines of the country—some lawful and more unlawful—for the exploiting of the mass of its own people, and the Gentile population of the entire country, in the interests of the lecherous few of its own number. Scrupulously collecting a tithe of all the income of its people, ostensibly for the relief of its poor, it unscrupulously uses this tithe for the real purpose of fleecing financially the pockets of its hierarchs and maintaining them the better in the grandeur of their harems. And all this it does in the blasphemed name of God. And thus doing, it has gotten itself so wormed into the big business of our country that in order to get at this the blackest sheep of the entire flock it would seem we must work serious injury to all the others. Banking, insurance, mining, manufacturing, mercantile, railroad interests galore are theirs and theirs predominatingly. Money is power. And money in the hands of the unscrupulous leaders of Mormondom, used for the purpose it is, is tyrannical power. And such indeed is the power with which American patriots are covertly confronted this very hour.

POLITICAL

It leaves undisturbed the **form** while at the same time it absorbs the **power** of civil government. Constantly protesting in the open that as an institution it takes no part in politics, it all the while in secret directs with absolute certainty the political action of all its people and, through them, that of multitudes of others. It gives of its funds to one of the great political parties as a favor and to the other to keep it quiet. It offers votes to help the party out of power on condition that that party if successful do its bidding, and threatens with political ruin by the withholding of votes from the party in power if it do not its bidding, and then—in the pretended interests of the republic—throws its political strength to whichever party through its politicians will make the best bargain with it for the furtherance of its unpatriotic interests. By centering its voting strength in the sparsely settled States of the West, (instead of in the thickly populated States of the East or scattering it throughout the country at large) and concentrating it at strategic points within these States it multiplies its political power over that of those in many other States from twenty-five to thirty-five fold in the highest legislative body in our land where it already has one of its traitorous oathbound apostles to lead its cohort of interlocking Gentile Republican Senators to carry out its will upon this republic, and to which on the 7th of November, 1916, it elected another of its priests similarly bound by treasonable oath to lead in like manner the Democratic Senators from the States over which it holds political sway. And all this it has achieved, from having absolutely no political strength or standing even, within the past twenty years! What, I ask, will twenty years more mean?

It should never be forgotten that present-day Mormon intrigue is the result of eighty years of **defensive** warfare—an intrigue much deeper and blacker than any that could possibly have been gained in the same or any other period of **aggressive** warfare. Lying for the glory of God and the

safety of the Saints is the great art of every faithful Mormon. The whole million or more in our country, so far at least as their leaders can influence them, are first-class Jesuits. They are submarining our country politically, commercially, socially. They aim, and are in too many instances succeeding in their aim, to deceive the very elect.—**Herald and Presbyter, Cincinnati.**

NEWS OF MORMON ACTIVITY

Mormon Organizations in Almost Every State and Canada.

Last year we gave some facts about Mormon organizations in the Southern States, saying that there must be at least two dozen actual organizations. We thought that such a number was very considerable. But facts which have recently come to light, though certainly incomplete and thus too small show that the former figure should have been **nearly three times as large.** Instead of only two dozen, there are, or have been, within perhaps two years, about SIXTY-SEVEN Mormon organizations in localities south of the Missouri line and east of Kansas, but including Texas!

Nor is the South alone in this situation. The facts before us show local organizations of Mormons in every State in the Union except North Dakota, New Hampshire and Delaware; and complete returns might easily show such in these States also, with surely still more in the States which are reported. People have been thinking of Mormonism long enough as a faraway thing, which did not concern them. The facts as incompletely reported are as follows: in the United States and edge of Canada, excluding Utah and the adjacent long-time Mormon regions of Idaho, Wyoming, New Mexico, Arizona and Nevada, there are OVER TWO HUNDRED MORMON ORGANIZATIONS of local members! These are in city and country alike; they are usually, if not always, the result of proselyting work; and their purpose is to hold and use converts, gather tithings for Utah, and make the places centers of outreach for more converts and influence, political and otherwise. Formerly the plan was to have all converts emigrate West; but the West is getting filled up, and the new plan has been in operation for some years as above. A whole town was founded in Texas, and is made up of Mormon converts; its population is about 700, according to Mormon statements, with a Sunday-school of 400. A Michigan school picture shows 49. The following list gives the number of organizations in the various States and Canada, according to our information:

Alabama, 5; Arizona, 7; Arkansas, 1; California, 14; Canada, 3; Connecticut, 1; Colorado, 6; Florida, 7; Georgia, 6; Illinois, 11; Indiana, 7; Iowa, 5; Idaho, 3; Kansas, 3; Kentucky, 5; Louisiana, 2; Mississippi, 6; Massachusetts, 3; Minnesota, 2; Montana, 10; Maine, 1; Maryland, 2; Missouri, 9; Michigan, 5; New York, 4; New Jersey, 3; Nebraska, 3; N. Carolina, 4; Ohio, 6; Oregon, 3; Oklahoma, 3; Pennsylvania 7; Rhode Island, 1; S. Carolina, 10; S. Dakota, 1; Tennessee, 3; Texas, 6; Vermont, 1; Virginia, 4; W. Virginia, 6; Washington, 9; Wyoming, 1; Wisconsin, 4. Total, 203.

Mormon Buildings Outside of the Utah Region

The Mormon newspaper organ announced nearly two years ago that they then owned **eighty-one** buildings "for worship" outside of the Utah region, and new ones are being dedicated every year. Besides the buildings in this country, the paper goes on to say that they have buildings outside the U. S. as follows: England, 9; Hawaii, 9; Samoan Islands, 8; Netherlands, 1; New Zealand, 3; Scandinavia, 6; Sweden, 2; Tahiti, 1; Japan, 1; total outside, **forty.** Besides these buildings

for "worship," there are several mission headquarters, as at Chattanooga, New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles, Liverpool, and perhaps other places, and the printing building at Independence, Mo., built last year. And to these may well be added the new Temple being built in Cardston, Alberta, Can., and the new building said to be projected in New York City, with others elsewhere. With nearly or quite two millions of tithing, as reported for the first time by the officials in Salt Lake last spring (under pressure from outside), and a large other income, what cannot be done in the way of building or other financial enterprises? The financial outreach and control of Mormonism is one of its great features, possibly matching its political power, and surely working with it like a twin cogwheel!

It ought to be recorded here that when "Pres." Joseph F. Smith dedicated the Logan Square building, Chicago, late in 1914, having come from Salt Lake for such purpose, he sat his No. 5 so-called "wife" up in the pulpit while he did so, and preached upholding polygamy! This was not in the Dark Ages, but in 1914! And he dedicated another the same day, and the next was feted by a high R. R. official in Chicago!—**Annual Utah Gospel Mission, 1916.**

* * *

THE MORMON PROPAGANDA IN GREAT BRITAIN

(The following enlightening special cable dispatch from London, England, appeared in a recent issue of the New York World. We reproduce it in full here, in confirmation of our statements in former issues that Mormon missionaries are being sent from our country to Europe to take advantage of the war there to further the interests of their diabolical system of polygamy. —**Editor.**)

With Europe in a dead grapple, the Mormon Church has chosen the opportunity for proselyting on a scale which anti-Mormon leaders and organizations assert to be the most far-reaching ever undertaken here.

As already told in cable despatches to The World, some of the ablest missionaries have come recently to Europe. The campaign in the United Kingdom takes first rank in their operations. In Switzerland and Scandinavia they likewise are redoubling their efforts.

The most active opponent of Mormonism in this country is Winifred Graham (Mrs. Theodore Cory), the novelist, who has severely arraigned Mormonism in several of her novels, in particular in "Ezra the Mormon," which has been translated into twelve languages, and her most recent book, just published, "Judas of Salt Lake."

Sees Serious Menace.

When interviewed by The World she declared emphatically that Mormon activity in Great Britain was a serious menace, and she and others who are fighting the Mormon Church hope the United States will refuse to permit its missionaries coming to Europe at the present time. As a consequence of her expose of Mormonism she asserts the Mormon leaders in this country have written her many threatening letters.

When a World representative called the novelist on the telephone at her house, Old Place, one of the landmarks of Hampton Court, she declined at first to be interviewed, but later called The World office to ascertain if the reporter was employed by The World, and in explaining her caution she said:

"The Mormons are very clever. It would be easy for them to try to see me under the guise of a reporter. They would like to get at me if they could."

This writer has the support of many church leaders and educationalists in her fight against the "scourge," as she refers to Mormonism. The Anti-Mormon Society of Liverpool is one of the biggest organizations in opposition to the sect in the United Kingdom. Liverpool is the Mormon headquarters here, with a branch in London.

"The people could, if united," said Mrs. Cory, "crush this serpent in our midst. Now is the moment to strike,

when the disciples of Joseph Smith are taking advantage of the war to further an evil propaganda which is a menace to Christendom. Expulsion is the only way of dealing with this fundamental wrong, and if the emigration authorities could but be forced to take action in the matter the evil would cease to exist."

How They Seek Converts.

According to the novelist, the Mormons have distributed in the last year in the United Kingdom a total of 1,534,323 tracts; they have successfully entered into certain features of war relief work; they have sponsored moving picture productions, showing in a seductive way the many charms of life in Utah.

"In these tracts which have been distributed," she added, "are the following words:

" 'It is by no means improbable that some future textbook for the use of generations yet unborn will contain a question like this: What historical American of the nineteenth century has exerted the most powerful influence upon the destinies of his country? And it is by no means impossible that the answer to that interrogatory may be thus written: Joseph Smith, the Mormon Prophet!"

"The rest of the tract reads like the most pure of religious booklets, though a Liverpool vicar writes me that he never has yet found one Mormon leaflet that told the truth.

"During the present crisis I am frequently asked whether Mormon missionaries have seized this opportunity to proselytize impressionable women whose husbands and brothers are absent in the trenches. There is little doubt that the wily elder—always afraid of the man of the house—can now more safely whisper the teachings of the Utah church. While our soldiers fight abroad, their women at home are being visited daily by these voluble gentlemen in black coats."

Are Preaching Polygamy.

That the Mormons are preaching polygamy, despite their protestations that they do not, is the stanch assertion of Winifred Graham. In proof of this she cited to The World representative one statement from their "Book of Ready References," which follows:

"The prohibition of polygamy is not only a prohibition of what nature permits in the fullest manner, but what she requires for the reparation of states exhausted by war."

"When girls are sent to Utah," said the novelist, "their friends and relatives never hear of them again. Immediately on landing, their names are changed. Seceders from the faith are placed under the ban, escape being made practically impossible by the network of Mormon spies surrounding the country.

"I have in my keeping a number of specific instances that plural marriage has been rife among officials of the Mormon Church since the United States Government forbade the practice. I also have affidavits and signed statements of people whose daughters have been enticed away by agents of Mormonism.

"These sorrowful instances come from Liverpool, Dudley, Pudsey, Birmingham, Edinburgh and other places. It is a fact that the majority of Mormon emigrants are women, always easier victims for unscrupulous men, who approach them under the cloak of religion."

The World representative was shown one of these letters, but was asked to withhold the name of the writer—the mother of a young woman who, she said, had come under the influence of a man who had turned out to be a Mormon. Her daughter had refused to listen to her family and had broken with her sisters, and intended going to Utah. This mother had appealed to Winifred Graham for help.

Aided by the Movies.

The authoress said it was only one of many letters of a similar nature in her possession and added:

"A number of active Mormons have recently congregated in York, where they are exceptionally busy. A very pretty girl who had been making ammunition and was home for a rest,

was touched by the attentions of a man who spoke to her in the street about religion. He made several visits to her house, and then a neighbor remarked, 'I wonder you aren't ashamed to be seen talking to a Mormon.' The girl confessed that she had been to a moving picture show where she had seen many beautiful views of Salt Lake City. She realized it was a trick and said, 'Lor, ain't it a mercy father's at the front!' "

To obtain an influence over some English girls, Mrs. Cory said, the Mormons say that many of their faith have died for the allies. The authoress, however, says that in the official Mormon organ in Great Britain—the Millennial Star—the names of a number of Mormons who had died on the battlefield were printed, and every one was a German and born there and was fighting for the Fatherland.

She declares, that the Mormons have refused to accept the challenge of the Anti-Mormon Society of Liverpool for a public debate on three charges:

1. Mormon elders have taken English girls to Utah against the wishes of their parents.

2. The passage money for these girls has been provided by Mormons.

3. Mormons teach and practice polygamy to-day.

Converts to Mormonism.

The Mormon activity in the United Kingdom is indicated by figures for the two months—April and May, 1916—compiled by the Anti-Mormon Society of Liverpool, which were cited to The World representative by Winifred Graham. During that time there were ninety-nine baptisms, the largest number—thirteen—being at Bradford. Other cities where baptisms took place include Manchester, Hull, South Shields, Burnley, Norwich, Mansfield, Carlisle, Liverpool, Leicester, Nottingham, Sittingbourne, Glasgow, Penarth, Bradford and Darlington.

There is no indication of the campaign spreading to Ireland, and the novelist considers this as proof of the active warfare which Mormons know would be waged by the Catholic Church. Nor does she believe that Mormons have been in any way responsible for the emigration to America in recent months of hundreds of Irish girls.

"Though there has been much slander by Mormons in anonymous communications," said Winifred Graham, "they do not dare to accept our challenges to come out into the open. That, to me, is conclusive proof that they are afraid to take action for fear of being exposed."

The World was shown by her one of the pamphlets on Utah which are circulated by the Mormon propagandists. It is well illustrated with photographs of the Tabernacle in Salt Lake City, and expatiates at length on the salubrious climate of Utah, the notable prosperity there and the high standard of health and education.

From details which have reached this country it is understood that the Mormons are anxious to build up a strong organization in Switzerland. The World learns from authoritative American sources that shortly before the war large numbers of elders and other representatives of the Mormon faith left Germany under urging from the Government, and a considerable number is supposed to have remained in Switzerland, where the colony has been augmented by further representation from Utah. One Mormon who arrived here en route to Switzerland lately claimed to be a close friend of Senator Reed Smoot.

"THE UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE IN THOSE STATES UNDER THE DOMINATION OF MORMON LEADERS IS MOST ABHORRENT TO OUR FREE INSTITUTIONS." From Report of United States Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections. Report 4523, Part 1, 59th Congress.

CRUSADE NOTES

Now is the time for all those in favor of the Anti-Polygamy Amendment, in the hands of the Judiciary Committee of each house of Congress, to write the chairman of each committee urging a favorable report of the amendment during the present session. The chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee is Charles A. Culberson, and that of the House Judiciary, Edwin Y. Webb. Address each, Washington, D. C.

The Mormon prophet, Joseph F. Smith, is out in a letter of commendation of "A Popular History of Utah," just off the press, by Orson F. Whitney. This seal of approval by the prophet is **prima facie** evidence that the history is pro-Mormon.

A correspondent from Bridgeport, Conn., writes requesting us to furnish a speaker for a proposed mass meeting in Bridgeport in the interests of the Anti-Mormon Crusade. This is but one of many similar requests constantly coming from all sections of the country.

Heber J. Grant, who succeeds Francis Marion Lyman as president of the quorum of twelve apostles, is very much after the type of the present head of the church, Joseph F. Smith; he possesses the same narrow and bitter mind; and he is financially greedy to the last word.

There is no partisanship in the Anti-Mormon Crusade. The settlement of the Mormon problem in our country far transcends all partisanship. It makes its appeal to patriotism, Christian patriotism. It will get little attention from the man whose Christianity and patriotism do not weigh more with him than his pocket-book and his political party.

In the light of the Mormon prophet's claim that he is governed in all his actions by the will of the Lord, his turning the vote of his people in November last to the National Democratic party can at most but lead any pious Republican to say, "The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord."

The Congressional Representative at Washington of the Eighth District, New Jersey, writes one of his constituents: "I have received several copies of the resolutions against polygamy, etc. You may depend upon me to do all I can against this insidious influence, as every decent man and American should do."

An evangelist from Vineland, N. J., writes us: "Will you kindly forward me accurate data regarding the Latter Day Saints (?) otherwise Mormons? In my evangelistic campaigns I propose to air this nest of vultures. I believe this is a moral issue and that it is a worse enemy to the community at large than Rum or Romanism. Keep up the good work."

The District Conference of the Scranton Branch of the Mormon Church was held in Scranton, Pa., December 10th. The necessity of present-day prophets was presented and commented upon at length by numerous speakers at this conference. According to the report of the conference in the official organ of Mormondom, "A large and attentive audience was present, the majority being investigators."

The January 1st issue of the Deseret News contains the photograph of twelve missionaries of the New South Wales Conference; that of January 4th a similar photograph of twenty missionaries of the Nebraska State Conference; that of January 11 a much larger photograph of forty missionaries of the Iowa State Conference. Glowing reports of successful work done by these missionaries are given in each case. Here is evidence of Mormon activity in our own and other countries.

Miss Frances B. Patterson of Chicago, for years engaged in mission work in China, India and Japan, says

that "Mormonism is pagan, blacker than the blackest paganism in the Orient, since it covers its teaching with a use of Christian terms." Coming as this does, from one who has made a comparative first-hand study of the different religions referred to, it ought to carry weight with all thinking people. Mormonism is not only pagan but blasphemously pagan. Its crimes and treasons even are committed in the blasphemed name of God.

According to a recent issue of the Deseret Semi-Weekly News, the first official act of Governor Simon Bamberger, after signing his oath of office, was to appoint B. H. Roberts a member of the State Board of Equalization. Evidently the new governor of Utah, though not a Mormon, does not regard polygamy as any barrier to the holding of civil office, else he would not have appointed to such office such a notorious polygamist as Brigham H. Roberts—and this as his first official act.

The Mormon church seems to be jubilant in the notion that the country accepts the Democratic victory throughout Mormondom as an evidence that the Mormon church is out of politics. All the politicians harp upon this constantly. They are overdoing it. By their much harping they have attracted the attention of the country which otherwise might not be specially interested in the issue. A great many letters come to us indicating that the people throughout the country generally are waking up to Mormon political chicanery.

Prohibition is being brought to the fore these days in Utah by the Mormon church officials and their agencies. The recently elected legislature is pledged to pass the prohibition bill. It remains yet to be seen whether this bill will meet the same fate at the hands of Joseph F. Smith, the Mormon political dictator for Utah as well as some other western States, that two previous prohibition bills met at his hands. If he can make a good financial bargain with the "wets" it is altogether possible that he will give orders to have the bill vetoed, as he did the two former State-wide prohibition bills.

Many keep inquiring why the Mormon vote changed from the Republican to the Democratic party at the last national election. Among the reasons is this: The Mormon prophet had been holding the Mormon political ear of corn before the national Democratic donkey for twenty long years without permitting it to have so much as a taste; and he began to fear that in the event this donkey should remain in power another four years it might deal with him from the other end of its anatomy. So he decided that it would be to the best interests of his kingdom to give it a bite now. It remains to be seen whether the Republic donkey will be braying for a bite four years hence.

Three years ago you could make but few Britishers believe there was a German system of espionage in vogue in their country. When told of it they would pooh at the idea. Today you do not need to argue it with them. They know it, to their sorrow. In like manner, in addition to the multitudes of people in this country today that do not know that the Mormon hierarchs have this country districted and subdistricted, manned and super-manned, by emissaries from whom they get regular reports, there are multitudes of others who, when told it, do not believe it. Reader, if you are of this class, all you have to do is to remain quiescent with enough others of the same opinion for the next twenty, or even ten years, and you too, like the Britishers, will know to your sorrow that there is and has been for many years a Mormon spy system in our country.

The Mormon church is as non-partisan as the late Jay Gould. He once appeared before a committee of the Democratic Legislature of New York to ask a favor for his Erie railroad and argued that he should have it because he was for the Democratic party. A

Republican holdover on the committee said, "Why, Mr. Gould, you were before this committee two years ago when the Legislature was Republican asking for this same favor and arguing that you should have it because you were for the Republican party. Is not that true?" "Certainly," replied Mr. Gould. "Well, you are mighty changeable, aren't you?" "Not at all, sir. You'll observe that both times I am for Jay Gould and the Erie railroad." That's Mormonism exactly. During the last administration it was for the Republican party. This administration it is for the Democratic party, while in both it was and still is for the Mormon church and its interests.

An attorney from Bayonne, N. J., recently forwarded to the Postmaster General at Washington a resolution adopted at an anti-Mormon mass meeting in his town asking that the United States mails be denied the Mormon hierarchs "for the teaching of crime or treason" and received this prompt reply: "You are advised that there is no law authorizing the exclusion from the mails of Mormon literature, as such." In writing us concerning this reply the attorney aptly remarks: "It seems to me that the solicitor of the Post-Office Department misses the point. Your object is not to exclude from the mails this literature because it is Mormon literature, but because it is literature which under any name teaches the violation of a statute, which under our statutes is known as a misdemeanor. If the Baptist church to which I belong was mailing literature that contained the same teaching, it would be subject to the same objection."

It is a well-known fact that public dances are conducted under the auspices of the Mormon church. A recent issue of the official organ of that body states that the directors of dancing of all the public dancing halls in Utah County met in Salt Lake City in convention for the purpose of deciding upon dances to be furthered during the coming year. Among other things it is stated that: "Everybody should be required to dance the dance that is programed or announced. Allowance should be made for some variety in methods of dancing new and unstandardized steps, provided the different interpretations are similar enough not to be objectionable. * * * Unchaperoned girls under the age of fourteen shall not be permitted in the public dance. The managers also recommended that twelve o'clock midnight be the standard hour for closing and that under no circumstances should the dancing be kept going after 12:30 A. M."

According to a recent issue of the Deseret Semi-Weekly News, Elders England and Gowers of the Mormon church, missionating in Ottawa, Canada, have by the Mayor of that city been denied the privilege of tracting or holding street meetings. Elder Sumsion, President of the Canadian Conference, wrote a lengthy letter of protest to the Mayor in which he said, among other things: "Perhaps great men in public positions are being deceived—Pilate-like—even to day. Perhaps this strange message of Mormonism may be related by future historians as repetition of history and events which accrued in the time of Jesus Christ and his apostles." These Mormon elders seem to be blind to the fact that because their system is a kingdom, set up in opposition to all governments and claiming civil as well as ecclesiastical authority over all peoples, civil authorities have the right to deny the emissaries of this alien kingdom the privilege of propagating its traitorous views.

If anyone doubts the present-day teaching of Mormonism to the effect that polygamists become Gods in the next world, he will be enlightened by reading the sermon in the January 4th issue of the Deseret Semi-Weekly News delivered in the Tabernacle at Salt Lake City, October 29, by Elder James E. Talmage. In the course of this sermon the elder says: "There are some who will develope as gods, those who

have attained the exaltation of the celestial world or kingdom of glory, and there are others who will develope in the terrestial kingdom, and others in the yet lower celestial world, as ministering servants; but it will be as utterly impossible for those who have attained to that degree of salvation only to become gods with those who have attained the celestial glory, as it is impossible for the wild crab-apple to develope into a peach." The above was uttered with reference to the development in the future world. Virtually it is a declaration that in the next world the polygamist as compared with the non-polygamist is as a peach compared with the crab apple in this world.

"I am not a Mormon, but have studied the Mormon system for many years, and have written several books upon its doctrines and practices. Furthermore, I am personally acquainted with many of their leaders including the first president, Joseph F. Smith, himself, and consider that I am fully qualified to speak on the subject with confidence and authority." Thus writes one, Webb by name, hailing from New York, in a recent letter addressed the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, vigorously attacking the National Reform Association and those who, under its auspices, are leading in the Anti-Mormon Crusade. And with this introduction he goes on in a diatribe of a thousand or more words to assert that there is no case against the Mormon kingdom and that the campaign against the crimes and treasons of the Mormon leaders is an ignoble one, carried forward by disgruntled persons and for the sordid purpose of money-making. These and other like insinuations, claims and arguments, so-called, have been met and overthrown by such high official authority; and they are such a trite repetition or paraphrase of the Mormon kingdom's own muddy maunderings in defending or concealing its offenses and its purposes, that one may well feel surprised to read the matter over the name of a man who asserts that he is not a Mormon. One cannot but wonder what in the world he is, anyway!

Not infrequently of late we are in receipt of communications from those who have forwarded to the Post-Office Department at Washington resolutions adopted at mass meetings in their respective communities requesting the denial of the use of the mails to the leaders of Mormonism for the teaching of the crime of polygamy or treason. These communications have in them a tone of complaint based upon misleading replies from the Post-Office Department. We take this opportunity of calling the attention of our readers to the fact that in asking the denial of the mails to the Mormon leaders for the teaching of crime or treason, we are doing only that which these leaders paid the great constitutional lawyer, Jere Wilson, $10,000 for arguing before the United States Senate Committee could be done in case the Mormon hierarchs violated the covenant they made with our government at the time of their surrender in 1890, nevermore to teach polygamy. Moreover, the resolution we use in our meetings has been thoughtfully prepared and has received the hearty endorsement of attorneys most intimate with the composition of the difficulties between our government and the Mormon hierarchs in 1890-96.

The Missionary Conference of the Eastern States Mission of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints held its regular semi-annual meeting December 3, in Boston. Among the numerous speakers at this meeting was W. P. Monson, President of the Eastern States Mission. Among the utterances of Monson were the following: "Mormonism is making the people think. * * * We are presided over by men who hold the authority given them by God to use in behalf of their fellowmen. * * * Joseph Smith gave to the world the facts concerning the personality of God, which they did not have prior to that time. He showed from the Bible that Christ took his body into heaven with him and that God has a

body of flesh and bones, and not mere spirit as is taught by the so-called Christian world. * * * My heart goes out to the widows and orphans who are left by the terrible war now in progress." In view of the above statements and the fact that one thousand Mormon missionaries have been sent abroad to induce war stricken widows to come to this country for the practice of polygamy, can any one rationally doubt the present-day efforts of Mormon leaders to continue and extend the practice of polygamy? The Massachusetts Conference is reported as being in a prosperous condition, "due to the faithfulness of the Saints who are obeying the law of tithing." The Conference is also reported as having been well attended throughout, "particularly by friends who had never before been to their conferences or attended a Mormon meeting."

"I may say that after long and painstaking inquiry from all sorts and classes of people, I am satisfied that the so-called 'disloyal oath,' supposed to be required of or recommended to Mormon believers, is an unmitigated fiction." The above is a recently published statement from the pen of a Jack-Mormon—one who while not professing to believe in the Mormon system is nevertheless quite willing to serve it for commercial or other reasons. For reply to his statement it will probably be sufficient to refer the reader to the report of the majority of the United States Senate Committee which investigated the polygamy and disloyalty of the Mormon church and gave its findings in the Smoot case. That report was made after more than three years of rigid inquiry. It is supported by approximately 4,000 pages of record, comprising documentary evidence and the testimony of the Mormon prophet, Joseph F. Smith, and other witnesses who appeared before the committee. It is definite to the last word. It stands beyond contradiction and question. It is dated June 11, 1906. It says that "The union of church and state in those States under the domination of the Mormon leaders is most abhorrent to our free institutions;" that "the church prescribes to its adherents an oath of blood vengeance against this nation;" and "that the accepted doctrine of the church is that it stands here the temporal kingdom of God and the only lawful government on earth."

A Mormon defender recently replied in print to a published quotation by the General Superintendent of the National Reform Association from an official book of Mormondom sanctioning polygamy. Here is what he had to say: "Mr. Martin refrains from telling you that this book was written over sixty years ago and is not a part of Mormon tracting or missionary literature." To this Mr. Martin made the following reply in the same publication that contained the Mormon defender's attempted refutation of the question first made: "As a matter of fact, the date line of the book from which we quoted is 1886, but half of sixty years ago. Furthermore, the book itself has been analyzed by a paper manufacturer who declares that the paper in it was never made until within the past eighteen months, also by a bookbinder who asserts that the binding is fresh from the press. And still further, the book was within six months sold by the Deseret News Publishing Company, the official publishing house of the Mormon church, and sent through the United States mails. What matters it when the book was printed, and especially when it was written, so long as it is sold as current Mormon literature? And as to its not being "a part of tracting or missionary literature" of the Mormon church, the claim is made by the church itself that 60,000,000 pages of literature, including this book, went through the United States mail this past year. Their catalogue advertises it among other documents of the church and you can buy it at virtually every Mormon church headquarters in the land. If the writer will come to our office we shall be glad to show him a whole library of copies of it recently purchased in many different places, by as many different people."

The Mormon church is making a great affectation of having set its house in order. Upon nearly every point of our contention, its emissaries have been taught to say that it has already "done it." The hypocrisy of this claim is known to many. There has been some repression of polygamy; there has been some financial accounting; there has been some variation in the political expressions; there has been some modification of the general oath of treason administered to the rank and file. But intrinsically Mormonism is just the same as when we began the Crusade. It is only waiting the day when it shall dare. Nothing but the complete fulfillment of our program ought to be accepted by the government and people of this country. That program may be briefly stated as follows: An amendment to our federal constitution forever prohibiting polygamy and polygamous living; a denial to the Mormon hierarchs of the use of the mails for the teaching of polygamy or any other crime; a public accounting of the government trust fund now in the custody of the Mormon prophet; the refusal of a seat in the law-making body of this land to any man in sworn fealty to the traitorous Mormon kingdom.

* * *

THE MORMON MENACE

Mormonism is a menace by its claims. Back of its organization, permeating all, dominating all, vitalizing all, is Priesthood. The claim is that when the Priesthood speaks, God speaks. Here we are at the fountain head. The Priesthood acts for God and in the name of God. It is bluntly affirmed that "by possessing part of God's power, they are really part of God;" that when Priesthood "speaks the will of God it is as though the angels were here to speak it."

* * * * * * *

Mormonism is a menace by its teachings. It is a cult of carnalism, gross, material, sensual. It teaches a plurality of gods, and its gods grow. Here is one of its epigrams: "As a man is, God once was; as God is, man may be." In the Mormon catechism, to the question, "Are there more Gods than one?" the answer is, "Yes, many." The Mormon church teaches that "there is no other God in heaven but that God who has flesh and bones."

The Mormon mind as expressed in its theology runs to sexualism. It is coarse, corporeal, and shockingly of the earth earthy in its ideas. If Mormonism teaches a plurality of gods, it also teaches that the gods have a plurality of wives. A man and his wife may have children after the resurrection, provided they "enter into an everlasting covenant and be married for eternity, while in this probation, by the power and authority of the Holy Priesthood." Mr. Roberts, one of the exponents of the faith, declares, on the authority of Joseph Smith, that pro-creation is to be "one of the chief means of man's exaltation in that great eternity which stretches like an endless vista before him." The menace of such teaching should be obvious enough. It is sensual, vile, materialistic, and must be inevitably corrupt and degrade. From the vices prevalent in Mormon communities; from the deceptions practised to hoodwink the Government and the people; from the brazen and highhanded violation of the most solemn pledges that human lips or pens can frame; we can clearly see what the moral atmosphere would be, if all deterrent fences were down, and the teachings of the Priesthood were fully incarnated in life.—**Dr. R. F. Coyle at the Portland Conference.**

MORMONISM

—Its Political, Industrial and Social Menace

ADDRESS

by

Miss Frances Bates Patterson

of

CHICAGO, ILL.

THE OBJECT

The National Reform Association was organized in 1863. Its purpose is to make and keep this a Christian nation. Consequently it must reveal what is evil in our national life. One of the dangers to the United States is Mormonism. Therefore the National Reform Association is exposing what is evil in Mormonism by means of a nation-wide campaign of education. And it is seeking to correct Mormon wrong-doing by legislation and the pressure of public opinion. A part of this Crusade is carried on by holding mass meetings at strategic points, to which admission is free.

THE ACCUSATIONS

The Mormon Kingdom teaches polygamy and these teachings go through the mail.

The Mormon prophet, "the seer and revelator of Almighty God to all the earth", who has all the power of a pope over his people, lives in polygamy now, because he controls the administration of the law of Utah and there is no national law to punish him.

Many Mormon priests are polygamists.

Mormons take an oath of disloyalty to the United States, swearing "to avenge the blood of the prophets upon this nation." (See Senate Report in Reed Smoot case).

The Mormon Kingdom misuses its trust funds and has become a leading factor in the beet sugar, salt and transportation companies.

The Mormon Kingdom sets itself up as a temporal power whose purpose is to overthrow this republic and establish here a polygamous empire.

The Mormon Kingdom has already, by colonization and political intrigue, acquired political control of or appreciable influence in eleven States.

THE SPEAKER

Miss Patterson has a **world wide experience** as a teacher and speaker. She spent five years in China, going through the Boxer uprising of 1900; she taught school in Japan; she spent a year in India; by investigation and study she has secured **a mastery of conditions among the Mormons;** she has travelled widely in the United States delivering addresses. She is **an eloquent speaker with a charming personality.** With all her experience she unqualifiedly asserts that **Mormonism is pagan, blacker than the blackest paganism in the Orient.**

COMMENDATIONS BY DISTINGUISHED MEN

"I am glad to commend the addresses and lectures of Miss Frances B. Patterson to all my friends. She is an interesting, enthusiastic and informing speaker."

Dr. Francis E. Clark, President United Society of Christian Endeavor.

"I regard Miss Patterson as one of the best speakers and recommend her for any audience, however large. Her spirit and manner are attractive, her message real and compelling."

Dr. Isaac Headland, Secretary Layman's Missionary Movement of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

"I have the honor of knowing personally Miss Frances B. Patterson and have great pleasure in recommending her. Her message grows out of a remarkable experience on the foreign field and she delivers it in a manner as winning as it is strong and effective."

John M. Moore, Secretary Baptist Forward Movement.

"I have heard Miss Frances Bates Patterson speak on many occasions and always to my great pleasure and profit. She has a splendid message and all her work is of distinctive educational value."

William A. Brown, Field Secretary International Sunday School Association.

"Miss Frances B. Patterson is a very unusual speaker. She knows her facts and presents them in a most attractive way. Without the slightest hesitation I would recommend her to churches and societies of all denominations."

Prof. George L. Robinson, Ph.D., D.D., McCormick Theological Seminary.

For dates and information address

THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION

JAMES S. MARTIN, Superintendent

209 Ninth Street **Pittsburgh, Pa.**

ITEMS OF NEWS

DEATH OF DR. COYLE

It is with sincere regret that we learn, just as this issue is going to press, of the death of Rev. Robert Francis Coyle, D.D., of Los Angeles, on Friday, January 12. Dr. Coyle was a Canadian, and came to this country in his early years. He was born in 1850; was graduated from Wabash College in Indiana, in 1877; and from Auburn Theological Seminary in 1879. He held pastorates at Fort Dodge, Iowa; Chicago; Oakland, California; Denver, Colo.; and was in charge of a Presbyterian Congregation in Los Angeles, at the time of his death. He was Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, at Los Angeles, in 1903.

Dr. Coyle was an earnest friend of the National Reform movement, and was one of the most effective speakers on the program of the Second World's Christian Citizenship Conference at Portland, in 1913. His address there on the opening day on the theme, "I am for Men," was a great forensic event; and his subsequent address on "The Mormon Menace" was a tremendous arraignment that no doubt did much to awaken the North West to the nature, purpose, and dangers of Mormonism. Dr. Coyle's diction was forceful and elegant, and he was a speaker of great ability. The National Reform cause, as well as the Church and Kingdom of God, has lost an able friend. Further reference to Dr. Coyle may be made in the next issue.

"Bible Study in the Public Schools for the Grades" by Margaret Morgan is a recent folder that has come to our table. It is quite suggestive and can be had by addressing the author at 646 N. Beaver St., Wooster, Ohio.

Dr. J. Renwick Wylie, Pennsylvania State Secretary, is back in Pittsburgh from Northern Pennsylvania, where he spent some weeks past in arranging a series of meetings to be addressed by Attorney Vernon J. Danielsen.

Dr. Larimore C. Denise, Assistant Superintendent, is back to the office from a brief tour up the Allegheny Valley in Pennsylvania, where he arranged a series of meetings to be addressed by the General Superintendent.

The Christian Statesman is in receipt of a very ably written article by the Rev. J. M. Foster of Boston, Mass., entitled "Christ's Second Coming not Chiliastic." It may be procured from the author by addressing him, 44 Russell Street, Boston, Mass.

Former United States Senator, Frank J. Cannon, is at present delivering some addresses in the vicinity of Denver, Colorado. He is soon to come East where, in company with the General Superintendent, he will fill a series of engagements.

Attorney Vernon J. Danielsen, during the first part of January, did some speaking in Kansas City, Mo., and vicinity. He returned soon after the middle of the month to Northern Pennsylvania, where he is listed for a number of addresses, after which he goes to the State of New York.

Mrs. Lulu Loveland Shepard returned from Salt Lake to Pittsburgh the 13th ult. She resumed her work under the auspices of our Association the next day, speaking that day at New Kensington and Arnold, Pa. From there she went to the State of Delaware for a week, then spent a week in Philadelphia, and is now speaking in Albany, N. Y.

Mr. and Mrs. Irvin M. Johnson of Philadelphia, following arrangements for public meetings made by them in that city to be addressed by Mrs. Shepard and the General Superinten-

dent of the National Reform Association, left the middle of January for Albany, N. Y., where they are engaged in arranging a series of meetings for Mrs. Shepard and other speakers of the Association.

Dr. James S. McGaw, our General Field Secretary, writes from Los Angeles that the California State Executive Committee of our Association expect to present at once to the Legislative an amendment safeguarding the reading of the Bible in the schools of the State.

The General Superintendent spent January 21 to 28 inclusive in the city of Philadelphia in the interests of the work of the Association. In addition to his speaking on Sabbath and certain week nights, he spent much time in interviews with influential citizens and in co-operation with the Philadelphia Committee in their efforts to further the work of the Association. He is at present writing filling a series of engagements in Pennsylvania.

Miss Frances Bates Patterson of Chicago, whose photograph and favorable commendations are found elsewhere in this issue, begins work under the auspices of our Association the first of this month. She is listed for a series of addresses in Kansas City, Missouri, and immediate vicinity. These addresses are to be delivered under the auspices of the Kansas City Anti- Mormon Committee of the Church Federation, of which Dr. J. Milligan Wylie is Chairman.

A communication just received from Salt Lake City from Mrs. Frances J. Diefenderfer, President-at-large of the National Order of Anti-Polygamy Crusaders, says that she has had an interesting time every moment since she landed in Salt Lake City. Mrs. Diefenderfer is, for the present, studying anew the conditions of Mormondom. She, in company with her husband, expects soon to go to California. Their address for a time will be 146 N. Electric Avenue, Alhambria, Calif.

As an evidence of the value to our cause of publicity in the secular press, we quote here from a letter recently received by Mrs. Lulu Loveland Shepard, following her address on Mormonism at the annual W. C. T. U. convention in Indianapolis. The letter from which we quote was written by a lady in South Manchester, Conn.: "Some time ago I read an extract from our local paper of your talk at the National W. C. T. U. convention on the power of the Mormon church. I have a paper to prepare on 'The Political Despotism of the Mormon Church.' I cannot find any books in our library to help me on this subject. Can you send me any help? The extract from your talk is just what I want. All I can find, besides that, is something written by the Mormons themselves, which of course is of no use to me. I feel as you do, that it is time our eyes were opened to the terrible evil of this sect and the only way it can be done is by bringing it to the attention of the people."

GENEVA COLLEGE

BEAVER FALLS, PENNSYLVANIA

Founded sixty-five years ago by the type of men who later founded the CHRISTIAN STATESMAN.

Dedicated to the promulgation of the great ethical principles which underlie the economic, political and sociological questions of every age.

Conducted as an institution of higher learning with recognized collegiate standing affording a liberal education in the arts and sciences, with special reference to individual and collective responsibility for the well-being of the nation.

Persons desiring special training in the fundamentals of citizenship for the purpose of fitting themselves as social workers should communicate with the REGISTRAR, Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania.